1405

TRUTH *againſt* CRAFT:

OR,

SOPHISTRY and FALSHOOD detected.

In ANSWER to a

PAMPHLET

INTITLED,

The CASE *fairly ſtated:*

AND LIKEWISE TO

The DEFENCE *of the* CONSIDERATIONS.

Magna eſt Veritas et prevalebit.

DUBLIN:

Printed in the Year MDCCLIV.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TRUTH *againſt* CRAFT:

OR,

SOPHISTRY and FALSHOOD detected.

WHEN a Controverſy comes to be reduced to ſo wretched a State, that the principal Advocate on one Side of the Queſtion, after having been convicted of the groſſeſt Miſrepreſentations in Matters of Fact, ſhocking Abſurdities in Points of Argument, and of the moſt pernicious Doctrines in regard to the eſſential Rights of Men, and the political Liberties of this Country, ſhall, inſtead of prudently acquieſcing, proceed to take Refuge in the laſt and moſt deſperate Shifts of Impoſture; flatly denying in the ſtrongeſt Terms, what he had, in his former Pamphlet, in the ſtrongeſt Terms aſſerted; affirming, on the other hand, Facts to be true, in direct Oppoſition to Eye-ſight; and after playing a Number of Pranks of this Sort, in the Spirit of *Peter* in the *Tale of a Tub*, proceed to a Concluſion with an Air of Triumph, by making an Appeal to the Public, whether the CONSIDERATIONS did not remain UNANSWERED? an Appeal of much the ſame Species of Modeſty, and carrying much the ſame

Degree of Inſult on the Senſes of Men with that of his worthy Predeceſſor juſt now mentioned, who appeals to *Martin* and *Jack*, whether the Lump of Bread he held in his Hand, was not as good Mutton as ever was purchaſed in *Leaden-hall* Market.—When Matters are brought down to ſo miſerable a Paſs as this, it is no great Wonder that a Writer of ſuch diſtinguiſhed Merit as the Author of the Pamphlet, intituled, *The Proceedings of the Honourable Houſe of Commons*, &c. *vindicated*, ſhould judge it unſuitable to his Character to appear any longer in the Liſts with ſuch an Antagoniſt.

Yet ſome little Notice would ſtill ſeem requiſite to be taken of theſe ſingularly intrepid Aſſertions contained in this Antagoniſt's Reply; ſo much Notice, at leaſt, as plainly to ſhew, that he has in Fact abandoned the Cauſe which he would be thought to defend; and has, at the ſame Time, rendered himſelf unworthy of the leaſt Degree of Credit for the Future, ſo as to be able to unſettle the Perſwaſion of any reaſonable Man, ſhould he continue to write on; for doubtleſs, write on he may, to the End of his Life, or till no one will read, if he is always to take the Licence of denying the Principles in his ſubſequent Pamphlet, which he had been ſtrenuouſly labouring to eſtabliſh in the one that had gone before.

This, therefore, ſhall be Part of the Purpoſe of the following Pages; a Taſk in itſelf highly diſagreeable, but in ſome ſort rendered neceſſary; and in ſome degree too the leſs irkſome, as it will naturally and uſefully fall in, after having anſwered the principal Intention of this Paper, which is, to adminiſter ſome neceſſary Inſtruction and Admonition to a late Writer, who,

without

without having acquainted himſelf with either Text or Margin of the real Subject in Debate, has unaccountably thruſt himſelf into this Controverſy; on Pretence, forſooth, at this Time of Day, of giving to the Public a true State of the Caſe, or, as it is expreſſed in the Title of his Pamphlet, *The Caſe fairly ſtated.*

It is peculiarly aſtoniſhing in regard to this Gentleman, that he, from whom ſo much better Things might have been reaſonably expected, ſhould, contrary to the Tenour of an Admonition which he is ſo well acquainted with, go about to teach quite another Doctrine concerning the Meaning of the capital Point in Debate, than what had already been moſt explicitly taught by thoſe who were veſted with Authority for promulgating the Myſtery, and laying down the Doctrine.

The ever memorable Tranſaction which gave Occaſion to the preſent Debate, was compleated in Parliament the Seventeenth of *December*, ſeventeen Hundred and Fifty-three; and ſurely it muſt have a very extraordinary Appearance in the Eye of common Senſe, for any Perſon to imagine, that, in Virtue of his polemical Abilities however diſtinguiſhed, it could at this Time of Day be practicable to cauſe a Conceit which he happens to be fond of, and which he chuſes to call a fair State of the Caſe, to be now received by the Public, as the whole of the real Queſtion, which on that Day had received its final parliamentary Deciſion, when in Fact, from the Beginning of this Winter to the Concluſion of that great Event, this Conceit was never once mentioned by either one Side or the other, as conſtituting any Part of it: So ſingular an Attempt is in reality no way inferior in Point of Abſurdity,

to what it would be in any modern ſelf-ſufficient *Dutch* or *German* Divine, affecting Moderation, to go about, at this Diſtance of Time to prove that the Debate in the Synod of *Dort* did not relate to the antecedent Predeſtination and ſovereign Decrees of GOD, but was wholly reduceable to the harmleſs Queſtion; whether it was not decent and proper for Men to make Acknowledgements of Thanks to their Maker, by the Favour of whoſe Providence, our Tables are covered, and we are enabled to reliſh and enjoy the Fruits of our own Labour? Or that admitting this was not then underſtood by either Party to be any part of the Subject of that Synod's Debate, yet as it was in ſome manner extractable out of the Terms in which the Queſtions were expreſſed, it ought for the Future to be conſidered as the Whole of the Doctrine, which the orthodox *Contra-Remonſtrants* wanted to eſtabliſh.

Who would not laugh, if ſuch a Man there be?
Who will not grieve, if the applauded Combatant,
Of *Tindal*, *Morgan* and *Bolingbroke* be he?

Be this as it will, no Man's Reveries can make any Alteration in the Nature of Things, or change the State of Facts already tranſacted.

From what has been obſerved, there would appear a peculiar Propriety in claſſing theſe two Writers together; the only Writers on the prerogative Side of the Debate, who ſeem to have engaged any material Share of the public Attention; for tho' ſuch a Conjunction may be highly unacceptable to the Author of *the Conſiderations*, and poſſibly to both; yet as the One in his firſt Performance found himſelf under a Neceſſity of aſſerting

ſerting for Fact, what has to a Demonſtration been proved to be falſe; and again, in his Second, flatly to deny what it is ſcarcely conceivable his own Eye-ſight ſhould not have convinced him to be true; and as the other before he could appear in the Defence of a Cauſe, ſo utterly repugnant to his well known Principles, found himſelf compelled to have Recourſe to the old, and always accounted diſhoneſt Trick of the Schools, totally to change the Terms, and thereby, as far as in the Power of the Sophiſt, the real Nature of the Queſtion; it cannot but ſerve a valuable Purpoſe thus to join theſe Pleaders together, as the Public will thereby have the eaſier Opportunity to judge concerning the Merits of a Cauſe, when it ſhall appear, that nothing but Falſhood and Sophiſtry, and Doctrines manifeſtly ſubverſive of all Liberty, have, by ſuch able Advocates, been advanced to ſupport it.

But tho' there be thus far a Conformity between thoſe two ſcholar-craft Writers, yet no attentive Reader can well fail to obſerve what a remarkable Difference there is between the Writers in Defence of the Rights of the Country on the one hand, and all thoſe who have written in behalf of imagined Prerogative on the other; the Firſt are not only invariably conſiſtent with themſelves throughout their reſpective Productions, but univerſally conſiſtent, and in all material Reſpects, ſurprizingly coincident, tho' abſolutely without the leaſt Communication the one with the other; no ſmall Preſumption this, that Truth, which can be but one, is the Foundation of both; the other, ſo ſtrangely diſcordant, that the Writers are not more numerous, than are their different Hypotheſes; an almoſt infallible Proof, that as Error is infinite, the Subject theſe Gentlemen would be underſtood to ſupport,

can

can have little or no Connexion with the invariable Principles of Senſe and Honeſty.

It is farther remarkable, in reſpect to the Author of the *fair State of the Caſe*, that he manifeſts a particular Fondneſs to ſpeak the ſame Language with the Author of *the Conſiderations*, tho' it is certain, and ſhall ſoon be demonſtrated, that his Principles and the Doctrine of *the Conſiderations* ſtand in ſuch Variance the one from the other, as no Art can reconcile;—Thus this Writer in p. 28 and 29, ſpeaking of the Power with which it was apprehended the Crown might naturally come to think itſelf veſted in Virtue of the Houſe of Commons paſſing this Clauſe, namely, that the Prince and his Servants, would have the uncontroulable, becauſe unaccountable Power of diſpoſing of the redundant public Money in whatever manner he and they ſhould ſee fit, expreſſeth himſelf dogmatically in the following Words. 'But the Truth is, that the Clauſe hath nothing 'to do with this matter at all: His Majeſty, if the 'Clauſe had paſſed, *would not have acquired any 'new Power over the Money in the Treaſury which 'he had not before.*' Compare this with the 4th Page of the Conſiderations, *&c.*

Now this Author ought to have known, that this is no better than a barefaced and ſhameleſs begging the very Queſtion in Debate: According to the declared Apprehenſion of the Commons who rejected the Clauſe, the paſſing it in the preſent Circumſtances, would have been veſting, in the ſtrongeſt Manner, *a new* and unconſtitutional Power in the Crown, by diveſting themſelves of *an old* eſſential conſtitutional Right; and according to the Apprehenſions of common Senſe, the paſſing this Clauſe would have been the giving *a new* Power of ſo evil a Tendency, as under a lawleſs-

a lawleſs-ſpirited Prince muſt render the Property of the Community an eaſy Prey to the Crown and its Miniſters; and a Power of ſuch a Nature, as even under the honeſteſt Prince upon Earth, might irremediably intail infinite Miſchief on this poor Country.

Every one knows, that there is one Circumſtance of great Unhappineſs, inſeparable from the Crown of *Great Britain*, that let the Prince have the beſt Heart, and the ſoundeſt Underſtanding which his Subjects can wiſh, yet, in Variety of Caſes, muſt he unavoidably find himſelf under the invincible Neceſſity of beholding the State of his Subjects, not according to Truth, and in its genuine Colours, but under whatever political Varniſh his Miniſter ſhall ſee fit to daub over it.

In ſuch a Situation how wicked muſt it be, and how nearly approaching to the higheſt Offence in the Law, to go about to perſuade the Public, that the Actions of the Miniſtry are imputable to the Perſon of the Prince; that the Maſſacre of *Glancoe*, for Inſtance, was juſtly to be laid to the Charge of the perſonal Spirit of the glorious King *William*; or the paſſing of *Woods*'s Patent to the perſonal Intention of that thoroughly honeſt-hearted Prince, and Father of his Country, his late Majeſty King *George*.

And ſurely it ought to be reckoned amongſt the worſt of all Injuries which a Man can commit, in reſpect to the State, to attempt to beget an Apprehenſion in the Breaſt of his Majeſty, that a conſtitutional Oppoſition to the deſtructive Meaſures of a Miniſter, or of his Favourites, is Diſloyalty to himſelf, when, perhaps, it is the very higheſt Teſtimony of Duty and Attach-

ment, which can poſſibly be given to him. See, in regard to this Subject, a Paſſage quoted below, from the 28th Page of the *Caſe fairly ſtated* * ; a Paſſage, which nothing, but the utmoſt Degree of Ignorance, even all the Ignorance that is *ſuppoſeable* in a Man who ſpends moſt of his Life in his Cloſet, can render in any Degree excuſable; its obvious Tendency being ſo groſsly malignant: But certainly a Man, who is yet to be inſtructed in that truly neceſſary and eſſential Principle, in regard to the Adminiſtration of *Great Britain*, that all that is Good, is to be imputed to the Prince, and all that is Evil to be charged, as far as the Nature of the Thing will poſſibly permit, ſolely on his Miniſtry, ought not to have meddled in ſuch a Kind of Controverſy. This, it is true, is not now to be remedied, and therefore, the next beſt thing to be done, is, to attempt, if poſſible, to reclaim the Author himſelf, and likewiſe ſuch of his Readers as may happen to have been miſled through their Reſpect to his Authority, from the preſent Error of their Ways, by making it evident, that tho' he has by ſome unaccountable Influence, been unhappily induced haſtily to range himſelf on the ſide of uſeleſs and groundleſs Prerogative, yet

---

* 'The ſeveral Conſiderations that have been hitherto 'offered, may perhaps tend to remove or leſſen the Prejudices 'many have entertained againſt the Clauſe, which was ſent 'over by his Majeſty, with the Advice of his Privy Coun-'cil in *Great Britain:* I ſay, by his Majeſty: For to ſup-'poſe, as ſome have inſinuated, that he was ſuch a Stranger 'to the Tranſactions of his Parliament, or of his Privy 'Council, as not to know, that ſuch a Clauſe was ſent 'over hither in his Name, or what it was, would be, in 'my Opinion, to caſt a great Reflection on his Majeſty's 'Wiſdom and Attention to the Affairs of his Government.' See *p.* 28. in *the Caſe fairly ſtated.*

yet ſuch is ſtill the Force of his good old Whig Principles, as every now and then, in this very Pamphlet, to conſtrain from him Declarations and Conceſſions as ſtrong and as full as need to be wiſhed for, in behalf of that very Right of his Country, which he is now underſtood moſt zealouſly to contravert.

Naturam expellas furcâ tamen uſque recurret.

This is indeed ſo remarkably the Caſe through the whole of this Pamphlet, that it will not be a Matter of any great Difficulty to ſhew, that once this Gentleman comes diſtinctly to underſtand the real Queſtion in Debate, if he will be but true to himſelf, and to the Character of an honeſt Man, he muſt inſtantly become an avowed and zealous Convert to the Cauſe of his Country, and be as forward, for the Future, in applauding the Spirit and Principles on which the Clauſe was rejected, as he has ſhewn himſelf eager, in his preſent Pamphlet, to cenſure and condemn them.

In order that the Public, as well as this Author, may have the whole of this Matter placed clearly before them, it may be proper to ſet forth, in as diſtinct a Manner as poſſible, the *real* Subject of Debate; whence it will inſtantly be ſeen, how totally different, and how intirely beſides the Purpoſe, is the fond Conceit of our Author, which *He* by dint of his Arts in Reaſoning, in direct Oppoſition to Fact and to Senſe, will needs have the World at this Time of Day to conſider, as *the Caſe fairly ſtated.*

Next, it will be eaſy to demonſtrate from the whole Strain of the Reaſoning, and from the

Principles acknowledged in this very Pamphlet that had our Author been ſo fortunate as to have underſtood the Point in Debate, in the ſame Senſe in which the contending Parties themſelves underſtood it, and which, for that very Reaſon muſt now, and for ever hereafter, be admitted as the only fair State of the Queſtion; inſtead of an Adverſary, we muſt have had him an Advocate for the Cauſe of his Country; an Advocate, on the ſame Principles, and for the ſame Reaſons, with thoſe very Writers, whom he hath ſet himſelf, with ſo much loſt Labour, and ſo prepoſterouſly, to refute.

After theſe few Articles are fairly and properly diſcharged, nothing farther can remain, in regard to our preſent Author, than to conclude with ſome ſerious and free Expoſtulations in regard to the Wiſdom and Morality of the Part he has acted.

In the mean Time, it is but honeſt to acknowledge, that it is not principally for the ſake of our Author, or of his Admirers, that theſe Pains are taken: The ſteady Perſeverance of the Public in juſt Conceptions and ſuitable Sentiments concerning the real Nature of the Cauſe in Debate, is plainly growing every Day of higher Importance to the Welfare of this Country; not ſolely in regard to the future Preſervation of thoſe eſſential Parliamentary Rights ſo critically reſcued, but in order to this Nation's Properly, and by Ways and Means moſt truly conſtitutional, diſcharging their preſent indiſpenſible Duty of diſtinguiſhed Honour, Gratitude, Truſt, and generous Fellow-feeling, in reſpect to thoſe of her Sons, by whoſe Wiſdom, Fortitude, and inflexible Integrity towards their Country,

try, and to the Prince who is the Father of it, this Deliverance was accompliſhed.

Therefore it is, that the preſent Taſk is ſo readily undertaken; undertaken from the fulleſt Conviction, that the rejecting of the Clauſe was abſolutely requiſite for vindicating the eſſential Parliamentary Rights of this moſt loyal Kingdom; and that what Repreſentations ſoever may have been ſent or carried into *England*, antecedent to thoſe worthy Patriots, who invariably ſtood firm to the united Intereſts and Rights of their King and their Country, unhappily incurring Marks of his Majeſty's Diſpleaſure; the only real Crime in which they could poſſibly ſtand guilty, even in the Eye of Envy and Revenge beholding their Conduct, was their ſo reſolutely thwarting the Ambition of a few Individuals; an Ambition, which were it truly underſtood, could not fail of becoming as odious in Fact, as it is in its Nature injurious to the Honour and Intereſt of his Majeſty, and of his Majeſty's moſt faithful and zealous Proteſtant Subjects of this Kingdom.

No one who has any juſt Conceptions of his Majeſty's Greatneſs and Righteouſneſs of Heart, can ſo much as ſuppoſe him capable of conceiving Diſpleaſure againſt the beſt of his Servants, merely for doing what they apprehended to be their indiſpenſible Duty in Parliament; every one, be their Denomination or Party in other Reſpects what it will, muſt be equally obliged to confeſs, that the Gentlemen who have been lately diſtinguiſhed by Marks of Severity, were at leaſt as able Servants, and are and ever have been as loyal and zealous Subjects, as any who have been, or can be found to fill up their Places.

The

The Concluſion is therefore unavoidable, that had thoſe worthy Subjects been fairly repreſented, they could not have incurred ſuch Marks of Severity. But this will ſtill be more evident from what is to follow.

The firſt Thing now to be done is, in as diſtinct a Manner as poſſible, to lay before the Reader the real Subject of Debate: For this Purpoſe, his careful Attention is moſt earneſtly requeſted to the following Particulars.

'*That* the Houſe of Commons, by ſending over the Bill without the Preamble, meant clearly to aſſert, that, in their Apprehenſion, the Commons of *Ireland* had in themſelves an ancient, inherent and conſtitutional Right, to point out to the Crown, by Heads of a Bill, as well as by Addreſs, ſuch Uſes of public Money remaining in the Treaſury unapplied at the Time of their Meeting, as they judged moſt conducive to the Eaſe of the People, and for the public Service of this Kingdom; looking on the public Money as the Money of the Nation, intruſted to the diſpoſal of his Majeſty as a Royal Truſtee, and upon themſelves, of all his Majeſty's Counſellors, to be the very beſt qualified for adviſing his Majeſty concerning the real Nature and State of the Country, in regard to theſe Articles; —and more particularly, as in Caſes of Deficiencies in the Treaſury, the Houſe had invariably manifeſted their Readineſs to bring the Nation into Debt, rather than the Exigencies of Government ſhould not be ſeaſonably ſupplied, ſo they could not but think themſelves, on the Principles of Juſtice and common Senſe, both intitled and obliged, as ſoon as the parliamentary Funds produced a Redundancy, to point out to his Majeſty an Application of this Surplus, towards diſcharging

that

that Debt, which they had been obliged to bring upon the Nation, in conſequence of theſe Funds having proved formerly deficient; *That* the Exerciſe of this Right could in no caſe interfere with the Rights or Prerogative of the Crown, as his Majeſty's Power, either of accepting or rejecting their Advice ſtill continued entire; *That* his faithful Commons, had always been ready to receive with Gratitude, and acknowledge with Thankfulneſs his Majeſty's Recommendations; but to make a Parliamentary Acknowledgment, that the Commons had *no Right to offer their Advice* in regard to the Application of the public Money, which had been raiſed off the People the Seſſion before, till his Majeſty ſhould be firſt graciouſly pleaſed to intimate his *Leave, or previous Conſent*, and that it was ſolely in virtue of his thus previouſly ſignifying, that he *would conſent*, they had now taken the Liberty of offering their Advice; this was in their Apprehenſion, ſo directly contrary to the known Parliamentary Rights and Conſtitution of this Country, that the indiſpenſible Duty they owed to the King, and to their Conſtituents in conjunction, and the ſacred Regard which is always due to Truth, would not upon any Conſideration, permit them to comply with it: And as all this was *confeſſedly* imply'd in paſſing the Clauſe, inſerted and ſent over by the Privy Council of *England*, they therefore found themſelves laid under the diſtreſſing Neceſſity of rejecting the Bill.

That theſe were the real Merits of the Queſtion, on the Side of the Commons; no Man of Truth, who was preſent at the Debate, or has ſince had an Opportunity of knowing the real State of that ever memorable Tranſaction of the 17th of *December*, can poſſibly deny.

And

And is there a Man of Honour in the Kingdom, ſo far poſſeſſing the Spirit of a Whig, as to dare to judge for himſelf in Matters intimately affecting the Rights of his Country, as well after his Governors have made known their Sentiments, as before? Is there a Man of this Spirit in the Nation, who muſt not think himſelf obliged to do all poſſible Honour to the Men, who, by reſolutely oppoſing this NEW and deſtructive Doctrine, have delivered their Country? delivered it, many of them, at the well-known Hazard of being ſtript, through malevolent Miſrepreſentation, of various highly honourable and profitable Advantages peculiar to themſelves? And is there a Man of ſuch Spirit and Principles, as juſt now deſcribed, and conſcious of being a Sharer in this great Deliverance, whoſe Heart doth not glow with a generous Sympathy and moſt affectionate Deſire, by every honeſt Means in his Power, to alleviate the Sufferings which the malignant Gloſſes of Anger, Detraction, and unmeaſurable Ambition, have already brought upon ſome of the moſt eminent of thoſe inflexible Patriots? Nay, muſt not even the Heart of our Author, and of all who are pleaſed with his *State of the Caſe*, ſo far as an ingenuous and liberal Spirit continues to have any Influence, be ſtung with Remorſe, when once they are ſenſible, that the Pains they have with ſo much Officiouſneſs been taking, to diveſt thoſe Gentlemen of the Eſteem of their Country, whom the inſidious Arts of its Enemies have been able to diveſt for a Seaſon of the Favour of their Prince, have, in reality, been imploy'd againſt Men, who, above being awed by the Threatnings of Power, when the eſſential Intereſts and Rights of this Kingdom ſeemed to them to be at Stake, went ſteadily on, in the

Diſcharge

Diſcharge of their Duty, directing and confining all their Proceedings, to the neceſſary Vindication, of what our Author himſelf expreſsly pronounces, to be *the fundamental parliamentary Rights of this Country*. See *the Caſe fairly ſtated*, *p.* 22. and firſt *Paragraph* of *p.* 23. See likewiſe *p.* 2. wherein he hath theſe Words; 'And if 'this were really the Caſe, the Gentlemen who 'were in Oppoſition to the Court, certainly 'ought to be diſtinguiſhed as eminent Patriots, 'and deſerve all the Honour and Applauſe, that 'their Country can beſtow upon them.'

That this was really the Caſe, and that the Doctrine acknowledged in ſuch ſtrong Terms by our Author to be deſtructive of the eſſential Rights of this Kingdom, was the real Doctrine intended, in virtue of the Clauſe, to be made the eſtabliſhed Doctrine for the Future, in regard to all public Money redundant in our Treaſury, no-body can have any Doubt, who either was preſent at the Argument, or who has read the authentic Comment contained in *the Conſiderations*, where it is avowed and laid down by the Author, in almoſt every Page of that Book; at preſent, there needs only to mention a very ſhort, but peremptory Paſſage in the 35th Page. 'If ſuch Truſt be in the Crown, the 'King's *Conſent* is neceſſary *previous* to *public* 'Deliberations on the Application.' All Deliberations of the Houſe of Commons, where there are two or three hundred Men, muſt, in their nature, be public; ſo that here we are plainly given to underſtand, that tho' there ſhould ever ſo large a Sum of the People's or public Money be got into the Treaſury, yet the natural Guardians of the Properties and Liberties of the People are not to be at Liberty to take the leaſt Thought about it: It may remain there for

ever, without the Nation, whoſe Money it ſtill is, being any thing the better for it; and if they are nothing the better, they will quickly be ſenſible, that they are vaſtly the worſe; and it may be otherwiſe diſpoſed of, without the Guardians of the Property of the Nation, being any thing the wiſer, unleſs the Crown, from its own mere good Pleaſure, ſhall condeſcend, of its own Accord, to *tender the Accounts*. See *p.* 41. of *the Conſiderations*. All this Doctrine we ſee can be confidently laid down, and the Authors the next Moment, with equal Confidence affirm, that no *new Power* is thereby added to the Crown, but all is in Affirmance only of the King's antient Right! Matchleſs Effrontery!

Much leſs however, than what has been juſt now obſerved, is more than is requiſite, in regard to our preſent Author. No body can diſpute, that the Senſe above-mentioned, was the Senſe, in which the Clauſe was underſtood, at leaſt, by one Side of the Queſtion, namely, by the Men, who from a Variety of Circumſtances were juſtly rendered jealous for the Liberties of their Country; and that it was ſolely from their conceiving the Clauſe in that Light they had oppoſed it: Now, what would it avail our Author, in Juſtification of the Part he has acted towards thoſe Gentlemen, even tho' it were admitted that the Clauſe was in fact capable of another and more harmleſs Senſe than what it was underſtood in, by thoſe jealous Patriots? tho' taking in the neceſſary concomitant Circumſtances it is demonſtrable it was not.

Surely our Author will have no Difficulty in allowing, that every Man, acting as a Member of the great Council of the Nation, is under a ſtrictly moral Obligation to judge for himſelf, and

and to govern his Conduct according to the inward Senſe and Perſuaſion of his own Mind; thoſe Gentlemen therefore conceiving the Meaning and Intention of the Clauſe in the Manner juſt now ſet forth, and our Author expreſsly acknowledging, that ſuch a Meaning and Intention would render the Clauſe, not merely bad, but deſtructive of the Fundamental Parliamentary Rights of this Country, what can be more evident, than that, our Author himſelf being Judge, theſe Gentlemen were under an indiſpenſable Obligation to do what they did, in oppoſing the Clauſe and rejecting the Bill?

On the other hand, doth not common Senſe make it evidently neceſſary, in regard to the debating and paſſing of Bills, that when one Side conceives the Manner of Expreſſion to carry a Senſe injurious to the Country, and the other Side doth not controvert, that the Clauſe, as it is worded, is liable to have this Senſe put upon it, ſhould it paſs into a Law; then, unleſs the Party originally contending for the Clauſe do really mean to have it carried into a Law, in that very Senſe which the other thinks hurtful, either the Form of Expreſſion is directed to be altered, ſo as to remove the Cauſe of Objection, or elſe the Clauſe muſt, of neceſſity, be inſtantly laid aſide.

In regard therefore to the Caſe now before us, ſeeing the Party contending for the Clauſe, never once in the Debate attempted to ſhew, that it was not plainly ſuſceptible of the Senſe in which it was underſtood by the Friends of the Country; doth it not demonſtrably follow, that they not only acknowledged the Clauſe capable of being conſtrued into ſuch a Meaning, ſhould it paſs into a Law, but that this Meaning is the very Senſe which

the Leaders of this Party wanted to have got eſtabliſhed for the Future, as the Doctrine of this Country; to the Deſtruction of the eſſential Parliamentary Rights of this Kingdom.

It muſt now be left to this officious Writer to explain, upon what honeſt Principle it was that he has been prevailed on to exert all his Influence, in order to derive Honour on the Men who had been doing all in their Power to carry into Execution a Meaſure, which, had it ſucceeded, might at any Time be made uſe of for ſtripping this Country of, what he himſelf expreſsly pronounces, *a fundamental Parliamentary Right of this Kingdom*; and, on the other hand, to practiſe all the little Arts which his Genius could invent, to detract from the Merit of thoſe Men, and to render their Character equivocal and ſuſpicious, by whoſe Integrity and Reſolution, that eſſential Right was vindicated and preſerved.

It will, in a particular Manner, be incumbent on this plauſible Gentleman to explain, how either his Head or his Heart could permit his attempting ſo groſs a Deluſion, as to make the Public believe, that the *Merits* of the *Queſtion* depended on the *abſtract Meaning* of the *Words* of the *Clauſe*, directly contrary to Fact and to Senſe; when it is impoſſible in Nature, that there can now, or for ever hereafter, be any other proper Queſtion concerning this Matter, than ſingly, 'whether it was fit for the Houſe 'of Commons of *Ireland*, to have the Clauſe, 'in the Senſe in which it was then underſtood 'by them, paſſed into a Law?' What can it poſſibly ſignify, in regard to the Matter in Debate, into how many Senſes the Words of the Clauſe

Clauſe are capable of being conſtrued, if it muſt now be agreed, that in the particular Senſe in which they were underſtood by the Houſe of Commons, there was an abſolute Neceſſity laid on the Houſe, if they would be but true to the fundamental Rights of their Country, to give their Negative to the Clauſe, and, in Conſequence of doing ſo, to reject the Bill?

Can any thing be more monſtrous in Reaſoning, and indeed likewiſe in Language, than to attempt making an eſſential Diſtinction between the *Intention and Deſign of the Clauſe it ſelf*, and *the Intention and Deſign of the* PERSONS *who were the Authors and Supporters of the Clauſe*, the only Subjects to whom Intention and Deſign are in this Caſe properly applicable? And as it is now put paſt all Doubt, that the Senſe which our Author, in *p.* 18, finds ſo much Fault with the Writer of the Remarks for having put upon this Clauſe, and which he acknowledges in this Place to be a *bad* Senſe *, and in a former

* That which ſeems to have created the chief Prejudice againſt the Clauſe in the Minds of the People is an Apprehenſion, that it tended to give the King ſuch an abſolute Power over the Money in the Treaſury, that without his previous Conſent the Parliament would not be allowed ſo much as to give his Majeſty any Advice relating to the Application of it, much leſs deliberate about forming a Bill concerning it. And that though it ſhould appear to them to have been manifeſtly embezzled, and applied in a manner even prejudicial to the Public, they could not without the King's expreſs Allowance and Conſent enter upon any Enquiry with regard to it. And that this would be a great Infringement of our Liberties, and of the moſt valuable Rights of Parliament.

This is the Strength of what hath been urged againſt the Clauſe; eſpecially by the Author of the *Remarks* on the *Conſiderations*. And this ſeems to be the true Cauſe of that Zeal which he hath every where expreſſed againſt it. It is on this Foundation

mer Paſſage, to be deſtructive of the fundamental Rights of this Country, was the very Senſe, in which the Clauſe was univerſally underſtood by the Houſe of Commons in the Day of the Debate; there is not any help for it, nor is there now any poſſible Remedy, but that our Author, whether willingly, or out of Neceſſity, muſt acknowledge, that, 'The GENTLEMEN, 'who were in OPPOSITION to the COURT, cer-'tainly ought to be diſtinguiſhed as EMINENT PA-'TRIOTS, and deſerve all the HONOUR and 'APPLAUSE that THEIR COUNTRY can beſtow 'upon them.' —— What his own Favourites, the Gentlemen who followed the Court in that Queſtion, deſerve, ſhall readily be left to his own Breaſt to determine.

How utterly out of Purpoſe therefore, and without the ſmalleſt Degree of relation to the real Subject in Queſtion, is that great Waſte of Reaſoning, concerning a poſſible abſtract Meaning of the *Words* of the Clauſe from *p.* 19, to *p.* 24! But as there is a Poſition aſſumed for an Axiom in the Courſe of that Reaſoning, which, conſidering the Perſon it comes from,

---

dation that he repreſents it as ſtriking at the *very Root of our Liberties*; and as tending to *make void the everlaſting moſt righteous Title of the Community to a valid Security for their eſſential Rights and Liberties.* And he talks of an *infinite deal of Miſchief, which imminently threatned this Country,* and which was *carried* off by rejecting the Clauſe. But this Gentleman, and the other Writers that have appeared on that Side, ſeem to me to have very much *neglected* that which is the *principal Thing* they ought to have *proved*, and that is, that the *bad* Conſtruction they would put upon it, is the real Intention and Deſign of the Clauſe itſelf. This therefore is what I ſhall diſtinctly examine, ſince it is upon this that the whole Force of the Objections againſt the Clauſe, and the Arguments for rejecting it manifeſtly depend. *Caſe fairly ſtated*, p. 18.

from, is, beyond meaſure aſtoniſhing, it cannot be paſſed over without particular Obſervation.

In *p.* 19. the Author has theſe Words, ‘ *To* ‘ *aſſiſt in this Inquiry, I ſhall lay down two Prin-* ‘ *ciples, which cannot be reaſonably conteſted. The* ‘ *firſt is, that in judging of the* TRUE SENSE *and* ‘ INTENTION *of the Clauſe, we are to judge by* ‘ *the* WORDS *and* EXPRESSIONS of the CLAUSE ‘ IT SELF,’ and in *p.* 23. to the ſame Purpoſe, ‘ There is no proper way of judging of the *In-* ‘ *tention* of the Clauſe, but from the *Words* of ‘ the Clauſe!’

Singularly lamentable would be the Event, if our Author, after the honeſt Zeal he hath ſo often teſtified in behalf of Chriſtianity, ſhould, by claſſing himſelf wrong, in a Debate upon Politics, come to be quoted as an Authority, in behalf of the fooliſheſt Claſs of the deiſtical Writers; Men who are for ever inſiſting, ‘ *that there* ‘ *is no proper Way of judging of the Intention* of our ‘ Saviour, *but from the Words of* our Saviour.’ Hitherto it has been thought abundantly ſufficient, in order to render contemptible and odious the illiberal Jokes of that Set of Men, barely to obſerve, that inſtead of interpreting Mens Intention merely from their Words, it is a Rule eſſential to Juſtice, and founded in Nature and common Senſe, always to interpret the Words according to the Intention, ſo far as that Intention is capable of being found out: Alas! ſurpriſing Critic and Caſuiſt! what would become of the Labours of your Life; and, which is ſtill of infinitely more Conſequence, what would become of the beſt Cauſe in the World, ſo far as it depends upon the Interpretation of Words, if, for Inſtance, theſe Inſtructions of our Saviour, ‘ *reſiſt not Evil.*

‘ *Take*

'*Take no thought for your Life*, &c.' '*He who hat-*
'*eth not his Father and Mother*, &c. *cannot be my*
'*Diſciple.*' And multitudes of other Paſſages, were to be conſtrued and judged of, merely from the Words? Strange! that Laws ſhould derive the whole of their Obligation from the Intention or Will of the Power which enacts them, and that whatever Merit there is in obedience, muſt ſolely ariſe from the Subject's voluntarily paying that Reſpect which is due to the Wiſdom and Authority of the righteous Legiſlator, and yet that the Subject need be under no kind of Concern, in regard to this Wiſdom, Will, or Intention; it is enough that he conforms to whatever Senſe his reſpective Genius ſhall be able to extract out of the Words, and ſhall fancy to be moſt natural, or grammatical. Beſides, is there not an almoſt infinite Difference between a Difficulty that may in ſome Caſes ariſe concerning the Intention of a Law already paſſed and eſtabliſhed, and the immediate declared Senſe and Intention of the Legiſlature, or any of its Branches, concerning the Meaning of a Clauſe, juſt then under Deliberation, whether it ſhall be paſſed into a Law, or not?

What a Mixture of Abſurdity, and total Perverſion of that which is right, has here been diſcloſed? and yet more or leſs of this, will always be found, when Men ſuffer ſomething elſe than Righteouſneſs and Truth to have the controuling Direction of the Powers of their Mind. Surely it is high Time for this Gentleman, to break off all Connexion and Communication with ſuch Politics and their Authors, as have already ſhed ſo baneful an Influence both on his Senſe and on his Simplicity of Spirit.

Evil Communications, it is unavoidable, muſt pervert ſound Senſe, as well as corrupt good Manners; how effectually they have had theſe Operations in the Inſtance now before us, will ſtill farther appear from that amazing Attempt of our Author, when after having, as he imagined, by dint of his ſingular Art in Ratiocination extracted an harmleſs Meaning out of the *Words* of the *Clauſe*, taken abſtractedly from the *Intention* of the Parties contending about it, He ſets himſelf to confer all the Popularity that could poſſibly ariſe from taking the Clauſe in this ſame harmleſs Senſe, upon the Leaders of the Party, who voted for the Clauſe; tho' he was very well aſſured, that theſe Leaders were far from *intending* this harmleſs and nugatory Conſtruction; and had, at leaſt, vehement Cauſe to *ſuſpect*, that thoſe Gentlemen actually meant that very Senſe, which he himſelf pronounces to ſtand in direct Oppoſition to the fundamental Parliamentary Rights of this Kingdom.

While, on the other hand, he ſhews himſelf moſt ſolicitous to detract from the ſo univerſally acknowledged, and truly exalted Merit of the Deliverers of their Country, by endeavouring to make the World believe, that the Step they were drove to the Neceſſity of taking, in conſequence of that painful Alternative, either of hazarding, through Miſrepreſentation, the Diſpleaſure of his Majeſty, or otherwiſe to betray what they were fully perſuaded was a fundamental Parliamentary Right of this Kingdom; *That* this Step had been frowardly or wantonly taken, merely in Oppoſition to this ſame harmleſs Senſe of the Clauſe: and all this, when it is hardly conceivable, that he could be ignorant, or rather could have forgot, that theſe very Men

had teſtified their Willingneſs to underſtand and approve of the Clauſe in this ſame harmleſs Senſe, ſo far and ſo long as the Nature and Circumſtances of the Caſe would ſuffer it to wear ſo inoffenſive a Colour; and *That* they had chearfully and frequently repeated their thankful Acknowledgments of his Majeſty's gracious Attention to the Eaſe and Happineſs of his Subjects, in recommending the Application of the Money in the Treaſury, towards the Reduction of the national Debt; ſurely ſo far as *recommending*, ſignifies the ſame Thing with *declaring, that he was ready to give his Conſent*, and our Author in the whole of his Reaſoning, ſeems always to conſider them as ſynonymous Terms, ſo far has the Houſe of Commons moſt thankfully expreſſed their Acknowledgments to his Majeſty for having in this Senſe previouſly declared, that he would conſent: after having had this Matter ſo directly under his Eye, it will be no eaſy Taſk, to vindicate this ſolemn Gentleman from the Imputation of ſome very inſidious Deſign, in repreſenting, *that the whole of the Debate was occaſioned by the Patriots of this Country refuſing to make this Acknowledgment, in this very Senſe.*

That the Author has in Fact exhibited thoſe Gentlemen in this moſt injurious Light, is put beyond all Doubt by Paſſages every where occurring in almoſt every Page of his Book, particularly, from that remarkable Paſſage in *p.* 12. and 13, in which he puts the Deſign of the Houſe of Commons, whether out of a ſudden Fit of Humour, or from ſad ſober Earneſt, into ſo ridiculous a Light, as muſt make every one laugh. See likewiſe the Paſſage already quoted from the 21ſt and 22d Pages; and in *p.* 23.

ſpeaking

ſpeaking of the Privy Council of *England*, the Author has theſe Words, ‘ eſpecially, when they ‘ had great Reaſon to think, that the Clauſe was ‘ omitted here, upon this Principle, that his ‘ Majeſty ought not to have previouſly ſignified ‘ his Conſent; (plainly taking this Word in the ‘ ſame Senſe, with that of Recommend) nor the ‘ Commons to acknowledge it.’ Again, in *p.* 25, ‘ the Queſtion therefore is, whether — it be not ‘ moſt fit and proper for his Majeſty to *recommend* ‘ that Application, *&c.*’ And not to multiply Paſſages in a Caſe ſo evident, the Reader is only deſired to caſt his Eye over *p.* 31, where, after the following Paſſage, the Author, in as expreſs Terms as any Man need to make uſe of, fairly gives up the *whole* of the *real Merits* of the preſent Debate; ‘ The Proceedings to be vindicated by Prece- ‘ dents is, the rejecting an Act relating to an ‘ Application of the Money in the Treaſury, ‘ confeſſedly of great Utility and Advantage to ‘ the Public, becauſe it contained a Clauſe, ac- ‘ knowledging his Majeſty's having previouſly ‘ ſignified, that he would conſent to that Ap- ‘ plication. This is manifeſtly, ſaith our Au- ‘ thor, the true Point in Queſtion.’ By the Way, ſaith the Writer of this Paper, this is altogether a falſe and abſurd Repreſentation, containing no one eſſential Circumſtance of the real Point in Queſtion; a Queſtion which related not at all to the Matter of Fact of his Majeſty's having ſignified his Conſent; but abſolutely and ſolely was no other than this, *Whether the Houſe of Commons were not ſtrictly obliged to wait for this Conſent, before they could be at Liberty to propoſe any Application whatſoever of ſuch redundant Money? and whether they were not likewiſe ſtrictly obliged, in the Heads of the Bill, which they ſhould bring in, in Purſuance of this* previ-

ous Leave, *in moſt expreſs Terms to acknowledge, that it was only in Virtue of this* previous Conſent, *that theſe Heads of a Bill in regard to the Application of this public Money, had been brought in?* ——Neither of which Articles was the Houſe of Commons, according to the expreſs and declared Sentiments of our Author immediately following, under any Obligation, not even of Parliamentary Fitneſs or Decorum, of which our Author ſeems to think himſelf ſo competent a Judge, to comply with; and therefore it follows, beyond all Poſſibility of Contradiction, that our Author has, in a moſt explicit Manner, given up the whole of the Cauſe he would be underſtood to contend for. This whole Paſſage, though it is of ſome Length, deſerves to be ſet down, as at the ſame Time, that it clearly lets the Reader into the native Sentiments of the Author, in regard to what is, *in truth*, the Point in Debate, it fully ſerves alſo to ſhew in what Senſe it is, that he had throughout his Pamphlet underſtood the Phraſe of his Majeſty's declaring that *he would conſent* *.

Could

Caſe fairly ſtated, p. 31.

* Many of theſe Precedents are deſigned to ſhew, that the Commons have a Right without any previous Conſent from the Crown, to point out ſuch particular Applications of the publick Money as they judge to be for the publick Service. But theſe do not properly come up to the Point. They that are for the Clauſe may very conſiſtently acknowledge, that when the Parliament judge that any particular Application of the publick Money lying in the Treaſury would be of great Advantage to the Publick, they have a Right as his Majeſty's Great Council to give their Advice relating to that Application, where it hath been omitted or neglected by the Crown. But the allowing ſuch a Right as this in the Commons doth not preclude his Majeſty from previouſly ſignifying his Conſent to any particular Application, nor make it improper for them to acknowledge that Conſent, when it has been previouſly declared.

Could our Author have but ſatisfied himſelf with ſuggeſting every thing that was plauſible on behalf of the Gentlemen of this Country, who divided for the Clauſe, tho' his Partiality might be wondered at by ſuch as were acquainted with his Principles, yet would it have been far from bringing upon him any Severity of Cenſure: Theſe Gentlemen, it was evident, ſtood much in need of an Advocate, and great Indulgence is always due to the Pleader, eſpecially where the principal Inducement appears to proceed from Compaſſion and Humanity; for this Reaſon it is, that the Writer would willingly ſuggeſt in mitigation of the Conduct of our Author, every thing that a proper Regard to Truth, and the Importance of the Cauſe he has medled in, will reaſonably permit; he therefore can readily ſuppoſe, that a great Part of the Incongruities, into which this Author has fallen, may have been owing to his ſtudious and retired Manner of ſpending his Time; when, ſpeculating in his Cloſet, and little acquainted with what is every Day occurring in active Life, he might, for Inſtance, naturally conſider it as a Matter hardly to be believed, that ſo great a Number of the profeſſed Guardians of the Rights of their Country, ſhould at this Time have appeared in the Support of a Doctrine, ſo manifeſtly deſtructive of the principal Articles of Parliamentary Liberty;

---

clared. If it ſhould be allowed, that the Commons have a Right to adviſe, or even to bring in Heads of a Bill concerning a particular Application of Part of the publick Money lying in the Treaſury, when they judge it neceſſary for the publick Good to do ſo, though there has been no previous Conſent ſignified on the Part of the Crown, yet it will by no Means follow, that when his Majeſty hath previouſly ſignified his Conſent, the Commons ſhould reject a Bill merely becauſe it contained an Acknowledgment of that Conſent.

Liberty; yet had this Gentleman been ſeaſonably attentive to the political Proceedings during the Courſe of this Adminiſtration, he might in ſome Meaſure have learned to account even for this ſingular and aſtoniſhing Appearance; probably he was altogether a Stranger to thoſe new Rules of Diſcipline, ſaid to have been ſent over previouſly to this laſt Seſſion of Parliament, in order to be carefully communicated to all ſuch Ears as were fitted to be entruſted with ſuch truly *gallican Arcana* of Government; whereby 'not 'only the Servants of the Crown, but all the 'other Members of the Houſe of Commons, 'who had expreſſed their Inclinations to ſerve 'the King and Government, were inſtructed 'and admoniſhed to be more cautious for 'the future, than ever hereafter to pretend 'to diſtinguiſh between what were immaterial 'Points in the Tranſactions of Parliament, and 'ſuch as were not; or ever to differ from thoſe 'in whom the Governor ſhould be pleaſed to 'place his principal Confidence; leſt he ſhould 'be laid under a Neceſſity of exerting the Au-'thority of the Crown in a Manner, which,' if you will believe the Author of theſe Rules, 'would be always diſagreeable to him.'

Indeed it will be no great Wonder, if our Author ſhould ſtill find it a matter very difficult of Belief, '*That* the Sons of *Britain*, Men choſen by their Country to be the Guardians of its Rights, and to have a principal Share in giving of its Laws, could through any Influence whatever, be brought to ſubmit to a Diſcipline fit only for the Servants of an eaſtern *Centurion*; 'To one he ſaith, go, and he goeth; to ano-'ther, come, and he cometh; and to a third, 'do this, and he doth it.

But

But it is hereby moſt earneſtly recommended, not merely to our Author, but to the Public in general, to make themſelves ſure, whether any ſuch Inſtructions had, in reality, been given and promulgated, agreeably to the *Fama clamoſa*, or not? For ſhould what is ſo univerſally taken for granted, turn out, upon the ſtricteſt Enquiry, to have been, in reality, the Fact; there can be no farther need either of reaſoning or Witneſſes: nothing can be more evident that whoever is capable of committing ſuch an Outrage on the Dignity and Liberties of our *Members of Parliament*, muſt be incapable of feeling any Remorſe or Reluctance in attempting whatever Meaſure would beſt ſuit his Purpoſe, however deſtructive it might prove, to the moſt eſſential parliamentary Rights of this Kingdom. Should *Rules* to this Purpoſe, after a ſtrict Examination, turn out to have been genuine; alas! there can be no need of an Inquiry how far and by whom they have been complied with; nor can any one be at a Loſs to diſcern, that had the Compliance been more general, the moſt precious Article of the Liberty of Man, as well as the moſt eſſential Article of the Rights of Parliament, muſt have been for ever given up; with this moſt aggravating Circumſtance, that all this Miſchief would have been brought upon this Country, in the Houſe, and by the Hands of her own deluded Sons.

But, bleſſed be God! a very different Spirit moſt glorioufly prevailed; and reſcued this Land, as yet a Land of Liberty, from infinite Evil; a Spirit which cannot be better deſcribed than by uſing the Words, with a ſmall Accommodation, in which one of the fineſt Stories in all Antiquity is expreſſed by *Daniel* the Prophet in the

3d Chapter of his Book: After having firſt repreſented *Nebuchadnezar* as calling before him three principal Men of the *Jews*, and requiring them, under a moſt ſevere Penalty, to worſhip an *Image* which he had ſet up, theſe three principal Men are introduced as expreſſing themſelves to the following Effect; 'O *Nebuchad-*
'*nezar*, we are not careful to anſwer thee con-
'cerning this Matter; our *King* whom we ſerve
'is able to deliver us from all thy Penalties, and
'he will deliver us out of thine Hand, O ——.
'But if not, be it known unto thee, O ——,
'that we will not ſerve thy *Favourites*, nor wor-
'ſhip that *Golden Image* which thou haſt ſet up.'
The whole Story is moſt worthy to be read, and will all along admit of moſt natural Accommodations, concluding, as every one muſt naturally expect it ſhould, that theſe three great Men were ſoon afterwards promoted.

But let all Matters of this Sort be underſtood as they will, it is now apprehended that, from what has been ſo diſtinctly pointed out in the foregoing Pages, in regard to the Contraſt between the real Principles of our Author, and the profeſſed Deſign of his Book, the Reader and, perhaps by this Time, likewiſe this Gentleman himſelf will be pretty well prepared to judge of the Juſtneſs of the following Argument; which is thus put into Form, that our Author, if he ſhall ſee it neceſſary, may, with the greater Preciſion, a manner he ſeems not very fond of, make his Reply.

Whoever is convinced that the *Commons of Ireland* have a Right in themſelves, to call for, and look into, the national Accounts; to inquire into the Redundancies as well as Deficiencies of the national Funds; and

to

to give Advice to his Majeſty, as well by Heads of a Bill as in any other Manner, in regard to what appears to them the moſt uſeful or neceſſary Application of any ſuch Redundancies; and in conſequence to vindicate and aſſert this Right by parliamentary Meaſures, when in any Inſtance they find themſelves in danger of being deprived of it, muſt of neceſſity acknowledge that the *Commons of Ireland.* in the laſt Seſſion of Parliament, did no more than they had a Right to do, nor than their Duty laid them under an indiſpenſible Obligation of doing in regard to the Bill for diſcharging the public Debt.

But the Author of the *Caſe fairly ſtated* has, from repeated Paſſages in his Book, manifeſted a full Conviction that the *Commons of Ireland* have the above Right in themſelves, and are moſt juſtly intitled to the full and free Exerciſe of it in all the ſeveral Inſtances juſt now enumerated.

Therefore the Author of the *Caſe fairly ſtated* muſt of neceſſity acknowledge that the *Commons of Ireland*, in laſt Seſſion of Parliament, did no more than what they had a Right to do, and than their Duty laid them under an indiſpenſible Obligation of doing, in regard to the Bill for diſcharging the national Debt. Which was the Thing to be proved.

Having thus pretty fully ſtated all Matters with this Author on the Subject of Reaſoning, it remains, that the Writer ſhould now diſcharge the remaining Part of his Taſk, in regard to this Author, by entring, for a few Minutes, into a

free Expoſtulation in regard to the truly ſurprizing Part he has acted, relative to this Debate: And

Firſt, Sir, it might, not without Reaſon, be aſked of you, who, while * conſcious of not thoroughly underſtanding the Queſtion, yet ſo readily, undertook to plead the Cauſe of Prerogative; Felt you no Remorſe in thus intermeddling, before you had made yourſelf ſure that nothing unfriendly was meant to the Liberties of the Country; eſpecially, as hitherto it has always been inſeparable from the native Jealouſy of a Whig, inſtantly to take the Alarm, as ſoon as he hears the Word Prerogative made uſe of in Oppoſition, or even in Contra-diſtinction to the Rights of the Community? But as this might poſſibly be owing to the Arts and Importunities of inſidious Adviſers, or to ſome ſtill more harmleſs Cauſe, it may be more proper to confine the Inquiry to the Spirit, and to the Manner, with which you have conducted yourſelf, in the Management of this Controverſy, after you had choſen your Side. And here, Sir, you are deſired to explain, how you could take upon you to repreſent the general Body of his Majeſty's moſt faithful Proteſtant Subjects in this Kingdom, Subjects whom you yourſelf know to be univerſally and zealouſly faithful, as *complimenting Gentlemen of this Country at the Expence of the King*; merely becauſe they had not underſtood the Point in Debate in the Senſe which you ſpend a great Part of your Book, in proving it was capable in the Abſtract of having been underſtood in, but without any regard to the Intention of the Parties, which yet was the ſingle Circumſtance on which the whole Queſtion depended:

And

* See the Author's Preface, and the 24th Page of his Book.

And becauſe, on the contrary, the People had moſt truly underſtood the Queſtion in the very Senſe in which it was invariably underſtood by the Friends of the Country from the Commencement of this Seſſion, and avowedly underſtood by the Leaders in the Oppoſition, indeed the only Senſe in which it was capable of being underſtood on the Day of the Debate; therefore is your Country to be repreſented by you, as *putting Diſhonour on his Majeſty*, and as under the Power of *Prejudices, which muſt of Neceſſity, diminiſh the Zeal and Affection of his Majeſty's Subjects to his ſacred Perſon and Government*; nay, *as inſinuating, that his Majeſty was for aſſuming a Prerogative which doth not belong to him, and which is ſubverſive of the Liberties of his People*, p. 2. and 3. A moſt odious and falſe Exhibition of the Spirit of this Country! ſpringing from that Root of Bitterneſs, which occaſioned your taking ſo much Pains to prove that *the Clauſe* was his Majeſty's own, and that he muſt, in Perſon, be anſwerable for it, than which nothing can be more injurious and abſurd. See what has been already ſaid on this Subject, *p.* 9.

Mark, however, Sir, that you have, in this very Place, notwithſtanding all thoſe unfriendly Inſinuations, expreſsly acknowledged, that were the Clauſe to be underſtood in the Senſe therein mentioned, and which it is but reaſonable to think you muſt, by this time, be fully convinced is the real Senſe in which it was, at the time of the Tranſaction, univerſally underſtood; '*then* '*the Gentlemen, who were in Oppoſition to the Court,* '*certainly ought to be diſtinguiſhed as eminent Pa-* '*triots, and* deſerve all *the Honour and Applauſe* '*that their Country can beſtow upon them.*' That theſe Gentlemen underſtood it in this Senſe you

have already, if you are a Writer of any Candor, as good as confeſſed; in *p.* 5. you have theſe Words; '*And, it muſt be ſuppoſed, that they* '*would not, on the Account of that Clauſe, have* '*rejected an Act of ſuch Importance to the Public,* '*if they had not regarded this Clauſe, as having an* '*ill Aſpect on our Liberties, and as deſigned to inveſt* '*his Majeſty with unconſtitutional Powers, preju-* '*dicial to the Rights and Privileges of Parliament.*'

Pity it is, Sir, that the Suppoſition of your being a Writer of Candor, ſhould neceſſarily bring along with it the Imputation of your having ſhewn yourſelf a very inconſiſtent and inconſiderate Writer; — You immediately go on thus, '*On the other Side, his Majeſty, with the Advice of* '*his Privy-Council in* Great-Britain, *hath, in a* '*very effectual Manner, ſignified* HIS DISPLEA-'SURE *againſt that Proceeding of the Houſe of Com-* '*mons, as an unwarrantable Infringement of his* '*royal Prerogative.*' What, Sir, could tempt you to expreſs yourſelf in ſuch a Manner, and in ſuch Terms as theſe? Did you, the profeſſed Advocate for Prerogative, in ſad, ſober Earneſt, mean to exhibit this Prerogative in the moſt odious of all Colours, by repreſenting *his Majeſty's Diſpleaſure* having *been* effectually kindled againſt his *faithful Commons* of *Ireland*; Subjects, who have never ceaſed to deſerve his Majeſty's diſtinguiſhed Regard and Complacency? Behold, Sir, the wretched Effects of your Petulancy in preſſing the royal Perſon of his Majeſty into the Controverſy!

But however untoward the Appearances may be at preſent againſt you, your old Acquaintance will never ſuffer himſelf to ſuſpect that you could ſeriouſly mean to repreſent his Majeſty as conceiving high Diſpleaſure againſt the worthieſt of his

his *Commons of* Ireland, thoſe who, in your own Judgment, *deſerved all the Honour and Applauſe that the Country can beſtow*, merely for theſe Patriots oppoſing, under a Senſe of indiſpenſible Duty, a Meaſure of his Miniſtry, which appear'd to them ' to have an *ill Aſpect on our Liberties*, ' *and as deſigned to inveſt his Majeſty with uncon-* ' *ſtitutional Powers*;' and therefore, Sir, no Alternative can remain, but that you muſt be forced, along with the great Body of your Country, to reſolve many of our late Appearances into this unavoidable Concluſion: ' That theſe Gentle- ' men muſt have been repreſented in a moſt ' injurious Light to his Majeſty,' otherwiſe, it would have been impoſſible that ſuch diſtreſſing Events, as have happened in the Courſe of this Winter, could have befallen theſe Gentlemen and their Country: If it ſhould be ſaid, that this Concluſion is of a very high Nature, let it be obſerved, that it is inſeparably connected with a Subject of a much higher Nature:

That it is abſolutely neceſſary his Majeſty's moſt faithful and diſtinguiſhedly zealous Proteſtant Subjects of *Ireland* ſhould continue fixed and unalterable in the rational Belief, that if his Majeſty had beheld the Conduct of his Servants in the Light, which, by them is known to be the only fair Light in which it ought to have been exhibited, it would have been impoſſible but that ſuch faithful and able Servants ſhould have continued to poſſeſs the ſame Share in his royal Confidence and Favour, which they were known to hold before the Commencement of the preſent Adminiſtration: In this all honeſt Men, of whatever Side of the Queſtion, if they entertain juſt and ſuitable Conceptions of his Majeſty's Greatneſs of Mind, muſt neceſſarily join, as it is a Truth univerſally known, and in moſt expreſs

Terms

Terms acknowledged by yourſelf, 'that the 'Cauſe of theſe Gentlemen's Oppoſition to the 'Clauſe, was their regarding it, as having *an ill 'Aſpect on the Liberties of this Country*;' And as it is the eſtabliſhed and invariable Character of his Majeſty to be not only as careful of the Rights of his People, as he is of his own Prerogative, but ready to relinquiſh every Prerogative, as ſoon as it comes in Oppoſition to any of their eſſential Rights, it is impoſſible he could be diſpleaſed with any of his Servants merely for aſſerting, in a parliamentary Way, what they underſtood to be eſſential to the Liberty of their Country, and eſpecially, with ſuch Servants as were of unqueſtionable Fidelity, and had long ſerved his Majeſty with diſtinguiſhed Abilities: Therefore it muſt be equal to Demonſtration, that Means have been found out to exhibit theſe worthy Servants and Patriots in a Light to his Majeſty very different from what all his Majeſty's faithful Subjects of this Country know to be the only true one.

And now, Sir, be pleaſed to look back, and ſee what prepoſterous Meaſures you have been taking: The Force of Truth has compelled you to acknowledge, that theſe Gentlemen have done nothing but what was highly worthy of eminent Patriots, in *oppoſing the Clauſe*, in the Senſe in which they underſtood it; and ſurely you would not have had them to have complied with this Clauſe, in a Senſe in which they did not underſtand it: You are likewiſe perfectly convinced that the great Body of his Majeſty's faithful Subjects of this Kingdom did Honour to theſe Gentlemen, merely on their being perſwaded that the Senſe in which theſe Patriots underſtood this Clauſe, was the true and real Senſe; and in this Light this Body of the Country were *as much obliged to do Honour to theſe Men*, as theſe Men were

were obliged to give all parliamentary Oppoſition to the *Clauſe*; yet you inſtantly proceed to repreſent them as doing *Honour to theſe Gentlemen*, at the *Expence of his Majeſty!* How could you find in your Heart to throw out the ſlighteſt Inſinuation to the Diſadvantage of this Body of Men? Men, whom you know to love and honour his Majeſty with ſuch Sincerity and Strength of Affection as to be ready to lay down their Lives in his Service; a Strength of Affection which it would be impoſſible for them ſo invariably to retain, unleſs they had learned to make an infinite Difference between the Perſon of his Majeſty and ſome of his Miniſters.

But to make you ſtill farther ſenſible how little qualified you were for an Undertaking of this Sort, let us next inquire what you could poſſibly have in your Thoughts in favour of *the Gentmen who voted for the Court*, after having made ſuch Acknowledgments, conſtrained by your native Senſe of Juſtice and of Truth, in honour of the *Men who voted for their Country?* The latter, you yourſelf own, rejected the *Clauſe*, becauſe they underſtood it in a Senſe, which if it were really the Senſe, would have moſt juſtly diſtinguiſhed them *as eminent Patriots*, and *rendered them deſerving of all the Honour and Applauſe that their Country could beſtow upon them*; they therefore are at leaſt entitled to all the Merit of the worthieſt Intention: It has been proved in the courſe of this Paper that the Gentlemen, or, at leaſt, the Leaders of the Gentlemen, who voted for paſſing the Clauſe, underſtood the Clauſe in the very ſame Senſe with the Patriot Majority by whoſe Votes the Clauſe was rejected; what, think you, muſt have been *their* Intention? or what can all your Partiality in their Favour ſuggeſt in their Defence?

You

You will not wonder, Sir, that, ſeeing you thought proper to take ſuch particular Notice of *the Remarks*, the Writer of them ſhould wiſh to be informed, how it came to paſs that you totally overlooked the 8th and 9th Pages of the *Supplement*, where the whole of that Senſe of the Clauſe which you lay ſuch Streſs on, and repreſent to the Publick as the only *fair State of the Caſe*, was minutely diſcuſſed, and the manner in which it came to be exploded, previous to the Debate on the 17th of *December* circumſtantially explained; ſome Folks may be tempted to think that this Overſight of yours muſt have been committed through Deſign; for had you condeſcended to take any fair Notice of this Article as it ſtands in that Paper, it would not be an eaſy Matter to aſſign any good Reaſon, 'that 'an old Notion, ſo thoroughly obſolete, ſhould, 'at this time of Day, under the Guiſe of a '*new* and fair State of the Caſe, have been 'brought upon the Stage.'

Indeed, after the Pains which that Writer had taken in ſeveral Parts of his *Remarks*, and particularly in the 10th and 11th Pages of the *Supplement*, to reduce the whole Merits of the Debate into a few diſtinct Propoſitions, on purpoſe to afford to every fair-minded Reader an eaſy Opportunity of diſcerning and pointing out any Falacy or Deception, if ſuch were to be found, it was no ſmall Surprize to him that you, Sir, who are ſo well acquainted with the Canons of Coutroverſy, ſhould have neglected ſo unexceptionable and ſpeedy a Method of bringing the Cauſe to an Iſſue: But if this was an Omiſſion, likewiſe by Deſign, it can have anſwered no Purpoſe; as by your charging the Remarker in *p.* 18th, with begging the Queſtion in taking

that

that for granted, which ought to be proved, you have thereby plainly acknowledged, ‘ that if ‘ this could be proved,’ the Cauſe you have eſpouſed muſt be inſtantly given up; you your ſelf pronouncing it, *bad*, and injurious to the fundamental Rights of this Country; and it having been in the Courſe of this preſent Paper repeatedly proved, that this very Senſe which you ſo highly condemn, was in reality the Senſe in which your Friends underſtood the Clauſe when they were ſo zealouſly contending for having it paſſed; can any thing therefore be more clearly demonſtrated than that, you yourſelf being Judge, ‘ your Friends were contending ‘ *for a very bad Clauſe.*’

In this Inſtance, Sir, you cannot but ſee, that the Diſtinction you ſeem to have been originally ſo fond of, between what you call the *Intention of the Clauſe*, and the Intention of thoſe who inſiſted on the Clauſe, can be of no kind of Significancy, becauſe the ſole Subject of Debate from the Beginning of this Winter was no other than this, ‘ What would be the Operation of conſenting to ‘ this Clauſe, taking it in the Senſe ſo repeatedly ‘ mentioned, of precluding the Houſe of Com- ‘ mons from bringing in any Heads of a Bill rela- ‘ tive to the Application of Money redundant in the ‘ Treaſury, without firſt having received Leave ‘ from his Majeſty to bring in ſuch Heads of a ‘ Bill; and likewiſe expreſly acknowledging in ‘ thoſe Heads of a Bill, that without their having ‘ had a previous Notification that he would con- ‘ ſent, they were ſenſible they had no Right in ‘ themſelves to propoſe any Application whatſoever ‘ of any public Money redundant in the Treaſury.

Thoſe who, in this Senſe, were for paſſing this Clauſe, inſiſted, that by paſſing it, no *new Power*

would be added to the Crown: Thoſe, on the contrary, who oppoſed the Clauſe, ſtedfaſtly maintained, that the paſſing of this Clauſe would not only moſt certainly inveſt his Majeſty with Powers that were *new*, but with Powers manifeſtly inconſiſtent with the fundamental parliamentary Rights of this Kingdom; — and in this latter Judgement you, Sir, have, in as full a manner as Words can expreſs, declared your Concurrence; and ſurely, Sir, you, who are ſo well practiſed in the Rules of legitimate Argumentation, cannot be inſenſible, when you take time to reflect, that reaſoning from any abſtract Signification of Words to the real Intention and Meaning of the Perſons who made uſe of thoſe Words, muſt in all Caſes be evidently impertinent and ſophiſtical, unleſs it can be ſhewn that theſe Words are not only capable of ſuch abſtract Meaning, but that they are not capable of any other.

In Page 9th you have theſe Words, 'And 'ſuppoſing ſuch a public Truſt of applying the 'Money given by Parliament to the Crown with-'out any ſpecial Appropriation, to be eminently 'veſted in his Majeſty, it ſeems to be very 'proper and reaſonable, that his Conſent ſhould 'be had, and ſignified previouſly to *the* APPLI-'CATION *of that Money, to a particular Service.*'

And now, Sir, after having attentively conſidered this Paſſage, are not you ſenſible that the apparent and moſt obvious Meaning which it tends to convey is, to repreſent the Houſe of Commons as wanting to take the actual Application of the public Money into their own Hands; and this too without troubling their Heads to obtain before-hand, either his Majeſty's Conſent or Aſſent? But tho' the Words are moſt evidently capable of having this Senſe put upon

upon them, would not you, Sir, be apt loudly to complain, if any one ſhould go about to infer, that therefore it is in this Senſe that you muſt for the future be underſtood to have made uſe of them? You, as well as all the reſt of the World, cannot but know, that the only Right which is claimed by the Commons of *Ireland*, in regard to public Money remaining in the Treaſury, is either to make it an Article in the Eſtimate for the enſuing Supply, or to *propoſe* to his Majeſty *ſuch* other *Uſe* or *Application* of *this public Money* as *to them* appears ſtill more conducive to the Eaſe of his Majeſty's Subjects, or to the public Service of this Kingdom; leaving his Majeſty in the full and intire Poſſeſſion of his conſtitutional Right of conſenting or refuſing to make ſuch a particular Uſe or Application of this Money as they had propoſed.

And now, Sir, lay your Hand on your Heart, and pleaſe honeſtly to pronounce, even though it ſhould refute the whole Purpoſe of your Book, whether it *doth not ſeem to be very proper and reaſonable* that the Parliament of *Ireland*, in virtue of whoſe Authority ſo much Money had been raiſed, as, after having anſwered all the Exigencies of Government during the Interval of their ſitting, to leave a large Redundancy ſtill to be diſpoſed of for the Eaſe of the People and for public Services, that they, in Virtue of their being the original Grantors of this Money, and likewiſe his Majeſty's principal Council, in regard to the Intereſts of this Kingdom, and beſt qualified to know in general what theſe Intereſts require, ſhould be free from all Reſtraints, and at full Liberty to adviſe his Majeſty concerning, what they apprehended to be, the propereſt Uſe or Application of this Money? and whether it would not be, in Truth, highly proper and perfectly conſiſtent

with the Dignity of the Crown, and every Prerogative that can be of any Uſe to the Kingdom, that, in ſuch a Situation, the royal Truſtee ſhould leave the original Grantors at perfect Liberty to give their Advice; and even that he ſhould aſk them to aſſiſt him in deviſing the beſt Purpoſes to which this redundant Money could be applied? Is not this even leſs than the whole of what the faithful Commons claimed as their conſtitutional Right this laſt Seſſion of Parliament? And could they poſſibly have claimed leſs than they did, without ceaſing to poſſeſs, and relinquiſhing their Title to what yet it is abſolutely neceſſary they ſhould continue to poſſeſs, ſo long as we are to continue a free Government, namely, the principal Power over the Purſe of the Nation? Is it not a perfect Deluſion to talk of the parliamentary Remedy of *with-holding of Grants?* Is not the Support of the civil and military Eſtabliſhment *abſolutely neceſſary* for the Safety of *Ireland?* And are not parliamentary Supplies abſolutely requiſite for affording this Support? What then can poſſibly remain towards affording any tolerable rational Security of this eſſential Power, other than the Repreſentatives of the Nation continuing in full Poſſeſſion of their inherent Right to recommend and point out to his Majeſty ſuch Applications of all Money already brought, or in the Interval of their Adjournment or Prorogation to be brought into the Treaſury, as they ſhall judge moſt conducive to the public Happineſs and Safety of the Country, and to call in the Aid of the Laws to puniſh all ſuch Officers of the Crown as they ſhall find guilty of Miſapplications and Embezzlements.

The Author of *the Conſiderations*, that Writer of Authority, was either directed, or permitted to tell us, ‘ that *unleſs Supplies were wanted, the*

‘ *national*

'*national Accounts* WOULD NOT BE TENDERED.' Common Senſe muſt always tell the Houſe of Commons, that Supplies *muſt* be granted, whether the national Accounts ſhould be TENDERED, or not; what then can there poſſibly remain towards preſerving to the Parliament of this Kingdom the principal Power over the Purſe of this Kingdom, but the Repreſentatives of the People continuing in full and quiet Poſſeſſion of the above eſſential and unalienable Rights?

Having thus, Sir, at great Length, endeavoured to make you ſenſible, that if you will be true to your own acknowledged Principles, you muſt, of Neceſſity, declare yourſelf in Oppoſition to the Party in whoſe Favour you have been prevailed on to write: It would be high time to bid you farewel, though Incongruities more numerous than the Pages of your Book remain ſtill ready to be pointed out.

But before your old Acquaintance finiſhes this Part of his Deſign, it may be proper, once more, to expoſtulate with you, why, having betaken yourſelf to a Senſe of the Clauſe, which had no Sort of Relation to the *Precedents* which had been produced in Favour of the Proceedings of the Houſe of Commons, all of which were urged from underſtanding the Clauſe in a Senſe totally different; you yet took it into your Head to animadvert upon ſome of theſe Precedents, which had ſolely been produced, in Confirmation of Rights, which *you* expreſsly acknowledge to be fundamental parliamentary Rights of this Country?

But much it were to be wiſhed that Incongruities were the worſt thing that occurred in this new and moſt officious part of your Enterprize; and

and ſtill it is to be hoped that, now the Fit of unnatural Zeal is probably pretty well ſpent, you yourſelf will be aſtoniſhed at what you have written on this Article of the Debate, particularly in the 35th Page of your Book.

In the preceding Page you take notice of a ſhort Paſſage in *the Proceedings*, &c. relating to the Precedents juſt before produced, where the Author pronounces, ‘ that one riſen from the ‘ Dead could not convince Perſons, who will ‘ ſhut their Eyes againſt ſuch concluſive Evi- ‘ dence as this ;’ and ſurely, Sir, it was but reaſonable that ſo ſtrong an Expreſſion coming from ſo able and diſtinguiſhed a Writer, whoſe Authority, in theſe Matters particularly, you could not but inwardly reſpect, ſhould have put you on your Guard, ſo as to make yourſelf ſure that you had ſomething very material to offer, before you would engage in a Matter which your own State of the Queſtion did not in any Sort make it neceſſary for you to meddle with : Inſtead of which you ſet out with a quaint Obſervation, ſo big with Abſurdities, if you did not mean Deluſion, as makes it difficult to chuſe where to begin in expoſing it ; your Words immediately following the above ſhort Quotation are theſe, joining the *Remarker* with the Author of the *Proceedings*, ‘ *But here it may be obſerved, that* ‘ *theſe ingenious Writers ſeem to have carried* IT ‘ *further than they themſelves intended. If the Pre-* ‘ *cedents here produced by them, were to the purpoſe,* ‘ *they would prove, that the Commons have not only* ‘ *a Right, but the ſole Right, not only of raiſing* ‘ *the Money, and of appropriating Part of it, when* ‘ *they raiſe it, to ſpecial Uſes ; but of* APPLYING ‘ *the unappropriated Surplus remaining in the Trea-* ‘ *ſury. For they repreſent it as the conſtant Uſage* ‘ *for the Commons themſelves to apply the ſeveral* ‘ *Surpluſſes ;*

'*Surpluſſes*; *which would be to leave his Majeſty no* '*diſtinct Power of Application at all, and this is* '*what theſe Gentlemen would not be thought to* PRE-'TEND, *and would indeed be inconſiſtent with the* '*preſent Conſtitution of this Kingdom*, &c.'

Whatever *bad thing* this Word IT in the ſecond Line ſignifies, you ſeem willing on your firſt ſetting out to acquit theſe two Writers, of any *bad Intention* concerning it; but this Candor and Senſe of common Juſtice ſeems to have made their abode with you, but for a very little Space; for before you get to the End of this very Paſſage, after telling us, 'that this *bad thing* would not 'leave his Majeſty any diſtinct Power of Appli-'cation at all,' you immediately come in with an Expreſſion as full of Malignity as it can hold, *viz.* 'and this is what theſe Gentlemen WOULD 'NOT BE THOUGHT to pretend.'

What Apology can an honeſt Mind form to itſelf for having thrown out ſo foul an Inſinuation?

The Repreſentation here given of thoſe Gentlemen is not only in itſelf highly injurious, but it is hardly conceivable that you yourſelf ſhould not have perceived it to be void of all Foundation; even when you were ſuffering ſuch Strictures to flow from your Pen.

Was it poſſible for any Man who has looked into theſe Writers, to form the leaſt Suſpicion that either of them ever meant, 'to repreſent it 'as the conſtant Uſage, or even the Practice in 'any one Inſtance, for the Commons themſelves 'to apply the Surpluſſes?' To apply them, in the Senſe in which you here want that this Word ſhould be underſtood; which Senſe is fixed by

by the Words that immediately follow, and for the ſake of which Inſinuation the whole ſeems to have been written; *which would be to leave his Majeſty no diſtinct Power of Application at all.*

You knew, Sir, as well as you know the Intentions of your own Heart, that all that was meant by either of theſe two Gentlemen, in producing theſe Precedents, (produced ſeparately, and without the leaſt Knowledge of each other's Purpoſe,) was no other than to demonſtrate from unvaried and unqueſtioned Cuſtom and Uſage, *Firſt*, That the Houſe of Commons claimed and exerciſed a Power, in virtue of a Right inherent in themſelves, of calling for the national Accounts; rectifying all Miſtakes which the Officers of the Crown appeared to them at any time to have committed in their Manner of ſtating them; cenſuring theſe Officers in Caſes where it appeared to them that there had been Miſapplications; and bringing whatever Ballance of the public Money formerly granted, and now in the Treaſury, or in the Hands of the Collectors, as ſo much Money ſtill remaining to the Credit of the Nation.

And, *Secondly*, That the Houſe of Commons did likewiſe, in virtue of a conſtitutional Power inherent in themſelves, claim and exerciſe the Right *of pointing out* to his Majeſty ſuch an Application of this redundant Money, when at any time they happened to find any ſuch Redundancy, as appeared to them moſt conducive to his Majeſty's Service, and to the Eaſe and Security of his Majeſty's Subjects in this Kingdom, making not the leaſt Difference, in the Exerciſe of this Right, between the Reſidue of the Money which had already been paid out of the Pockets of his Majeſty's Subjects, and brought into

into the Treaſury for the two Years that were paſſed, and the Money which was now to be brought into it for the two Years to come: Tell honeſtly then, Sir, do not the Precedents produced by theſe Gentlemen fully and irreſiſtibly prove every ſingle Article contained under theſe two Propoſitions? And tho' both the Propoſitions, and the Precedents brought to ſupport them, may be but very little to the Purpoſe in regard to *your Senſe* of the Clauſe, which probably was not, at that time, ſo much as once in the contemplation of thoſe Writers, having appeared to them totally foreign from the real Queſtion in Debate; yet ſurely you muſt allow that they are directly to the Purpoſe, in reſpect to the *Author of the Conſiderations*, *againſt whom they were writing*; who had ſet himſelf to defend and propagate a Doctrine, diametrically and confeſſedly oppoſite to every material Article in theſe Propoſitions? In what a State muſt your Mind then have been, when you wanted to make your Readers believe, that theſe parliamentary Precedents were not to the Purpoſe! or when you aſſert that 'theſe Precedents would prove, that the Commons have 'not only a Right, but the ſole Right not only of 'raiſing the Money, and appropriating Part of 'it, when they raiſe it, to ſpecial Uſes, but of '*applying* the unappropriated Surplus remaining 'in the Treaſury. For they (that is, theſe 'Writers) repreſent it as *the conſtant Uſage* for 'the Commons *themſelves* to *apply* the ſeveral 'Surpluſſes.'

Theſe, Sir, are your own Words: Would to God they were not!

Thus much, Sir, concerning the Morality of this remarkable Quotation; now a few Words more in regard to the Senſe. You tell us that

theſe Precedents on which the two Writers lay ſo much Streſs, would prove ‘ *that the Commons* ‘ *have not only a Right, but the ſole Right*, &c.’ Pray, Sir, are they not real Precedents, or authentic Records of former Tranſactions of the Houſe of Commons, fairly and faithfully quoted? Were not theſe Tranſactions, public parliamentary Tranſactions; never called in Queſtion, but fully and invariably approved of, as truly conſtitutional, by the Crown and the Miniſtry, and all Parties concerned? How then can the bare quoting of theſe prove any thing beyond what was the real Meaning of the reſpective Tranſactions of which they are the Records? eſpecially, how can the quoting of them be ſaid in any Senſe to prove that the Commons claimed the *ſole Right of raiſing, and appropriating*, &c. ſo directly inconſiſtent with the Conſtitution of this Kingdom? Surely, Sir, nothing ſhort of Repentance and Converſion can procure ſuch complicated Offences againſt Candor and Senſe to be blotted out.

Again, Sir, what poſſibly can be ſaid for your ſo ſtrenuouſly exerting your Talents in Argumentation, *p.* 40, and 41, in order that the clandeſtine and anticonſtitutional Tranſaction in the Year 1751 ſhould yet be received into the Claſs of legitimate Precedents? However conſiſtent you may poſſibly think it with orthodox Divinity, yet ſurely you muſt acknowledge it totally repugnant to the firſt Principles of Morals, that any Action ſhould be imputable in any other Proportion than that in which it appears to be voluntary; and whether the Houſe of Commons paſſing the Bill in the Seſſion 1751, as it came altered from *England*, did not abundantly appear to be ſore againſt their Will, let all the World judge!

But

But if you have happened to read over what the Writer of the *Remarks* has urged upon this Head, in his 4th Number, from *p.* 43, to the End of the firſt Paragraph in *p.* 48, and are not yet convinced that the Precedent is ſo ſpurious, as to render the inſiſting on it infamous, nothing that is in the Power of your old Acquaintance farther to ſuggeſt, would be able to make any Impreſſion; the utmoſt he can do, is earneſtly to recommend it to you once more to review the latter End of that Number.

It remains now only to take ſome Notice of your ſingularly prepoſterous Attempt to get rid of that truly legitimate and inconteſtable Precedent, taken from the parliamentary Grant in the Reign of *Charles* II. of the Sum of two thouſand Pounds to Sir *Henry Tichburn*, urged at the Concluſion of the third Number of *Remarks*.

It is not denied by you, that the Houſe of Commons, without any Leave, or any previous Notice whatever from the Crown, were the firſt Movers in regard to the Application of theſe two thouſand Pounds, out of a Fund, granted to his Majeſty ſome Years before; and therefore, in its obvious Senſe, the whole of this Tranſaction would appear to be a full and direct Proof of what it is adduced for, namely, 'that the Houſe 'of Commons, even at that Time, when Notions 'of Prerogative ran ſo very high, had not the 'leaſt Doubt of their having an inherent Right 'to point out to his Majeſty, by Heads of a Bill, 'ſuch Applications of Money formerly granted 'by Parliament, as appeared to them neceſſary 'or expedient for the Uſes of Government:' No, ſay you, this Inſtance is not to the Purpoſe: 'The Hearth-Money was granted to the King in

'lieu of the *Profits* of the *Court of Wards*, but 'in the original Act by which the *Hearth-Money* 'was granted to his Majeſty, the Crown was 'expreſsly precluded from charging it with Gift, 'Grant, or Penſion;' and that therefore the Crown had no Power to grant Sir *Henry Tichburn* two thouſand Pounds, or, in Truth, to pay him a juſt Debt, unleſs enabled by the whole Legiſlature to do ſo, out of this Tax.

See now, Sir, what it is to meddle with a Matter which you either know nothing of, or which you were obliged moſt abſurdly to miſrepreſent, before you could pretend to invalidate its being a direct Proof, 'that, as far as Prece-'dent can be a Proof, the Houſe of Commons 'under King *George* ought to be allowed the ſame 'Right over the public Money, that was mani-'feſtly claimed, practiſed, and recognized, as 'their inherent Right under CHARLES *the ſecond*:' In Earneſt, Sir, could you really mean, that King *Charles* was wanting to do Juſtice to Sir *Henry Tichburn*, but had no Way of doing it, without Leave from his Parliament? Alas! Sir, it is evident from the Whole of this Tranſaction, that it was with the utmoſt Difficulty the Houſe of Commons could obtain Juſtice to be done to this honeſt Gentleman: Could it ever enter into your Head, that becauſe the King was reſtrained from granting Gifts or Penſions ſo as to leſſen this Fund for the Support of the Crown in the Hands of his Succeſſors, therefore he could not apply any Part of it to pay a juſt Debt, nor ſpend the preſent Income ariſing from it in the ſame Manner in which he ſpent the Profits of the *Wards and Liveries*, in the Place of which this Tax was granted to him. How could you conceive it *poſſible* that he could be under any Reſtraint in Regard to the *Uſe*, after he had got the Money

actually

actually into his Coffers? There is, in Truth, ſo much Folly mixed with the little Conceits of a pettifogging Attorney in what you have written on this Subject, that your old Acquaintance cannot help ſuſpecting, that a very undue Influence of Folks, of much leſs Senſe, and ſtill of far leſs Honeſty than yourſelf, has betrayed you into Meaſures, where it has been impoſſible for you to take one Step without doing Diſhonour to the Powers of your Underſtanding, or to the Qualities of your Heart: — The invidious Inſinuation in the Cloſe of what you have written on this Article, *p.* 34. after what you had read over and over in the *Remarks*, is paſt all Excuſe.

It would be endleſs to point out every Thing truly exceptionable that is to be found in this ill-judged Production; what has already been ſaid, it is hoped, may be ſufficient to rouze you to the free Exertion of the native Bent and Principles of your own Mind; in which Expectation your Acquaintance takes his Leave, with an affectionate Recommendation of the Example of the immortal *Chillingworth* to your future Imitation.

You are not ignorant, that this excellent Perſon, from miſtaking the Nature of the *Proteſtant Religion*, haſtily delivered himſelf over to the Superſtition of *Rome*; but ſoon coming to diſcern, that firſt, in regard to his new Leaders, all was Inſolence or Craft, Impoſture or Domination; and that, in regard to the Herd of their Followers, inſtead of any Symptoms of a rational free-born Spirit, nothing was to be found, nor would any thing elſe be endured, but an implicit and abject Reſignation of themſelves, and of all their Faculties, to the abſolute Directions, either of their primary, or delegated Conductors; theſe unhappy and moſt degenerated People, at the

ſame

ſame Time, making the loudeſt Pretenſions to the Denomination of the only true and untainted Diſciples of a Maſter, who had, in moſt expreſs Terms, inſiſted with all his Followers, that they ſhould quit themſelves like Men, and judge for themſelves: It was no Wonder, that the ſound Underſtanding of *Chillingworth* quickly cauſed him to break off all Manner of Connexion with ſuch a Confederacy; a Confederacy formed from Policies totally repugnant to the original generous Bent and Principles of his Mind: And having, by this Time, come clearly to perceive that the native Principles of Senſe and Honeſty, together with a few *plain Records*, 'void of all *artificial Com-* 'ments,' contained in the *Bible*, were in truth the only Foundation of the Religion of *Proteſtants*; all the World knows how diſtinguiſhed a Champion he afterwards became in that glorious Cauſe, which, through Miſapprehenſion of its real and intrinſic Merits, and ſome other Infelicities, he had before, for a Seaſon, been led to deſert.

But it is now high time, in order to complete the Deſign of this Paper, to proceed to the other Article propoſed, namely, ſo far to take notice of *the Defence of the Conſiderations* as will be ſufficient to ſhew, that the Author in this ſecond Performance which he calls *An Anſwer to the Proceedings*, &c. has intirely given up the principal Points in Debate: Given them up, not as the Firſt-fruits of an honeſt Repentance, from an ingenuous Senſe of having been in the wrong; but in all Appearance, firſt, becauſe the real Doctrine intended by his Patrons to have been eſtabliſhed in this Country, had the Queſtion been carried in favour of the Bill, has been ſet in a Light, in conſequence of his own Explanation of it, which few even of the Leaders, and much fewer of the

the Gentlemen of this Country, who were for ſupporting the Clauſe, would probably at preſent care to avow; now that the Deſign has, through the inflexible Virtue of the Patriots of this Country, been for ever defeated. And ſecondly,

Becauſe the Author would ſeem to congratulate with himſelf not a little, that at the ſame time he was thus extricating himſelf and his Patrons from infinite Reproach, by denying or ſoftning every odious Conſequence of the Doctrine he had, in virtue of their Authority, been labouring to eſtabliſh; he had found out a Trick by which he ſhould be ſtill able to make his Readers believe that his original Doctrine remained intire and unſhaken, and that nothing was given up: A Trick which had coſt him but little Labour of Invention, as it was no more than flatly to deny, what he had before in expreſs Terms affirmed; to affirm, what he had moſt expreſly denied; to perſiſt in denying what, to his own Eye-ſight, had been exhibited to be Fact; and then to round up the whole, by an Appeal to his candid Reader, 'whether his Book of Con-'ſiderations did not remain UNANSWERED?'

That this is the Game which our Author has been playing in his ſecond Production, will not require much Labour to demonſtrate: But *firſt*, it is moſt carefully to be remarked, that the Difference is immenſe, in Point of Importance to the Public, between this Author's original Production, and what he has ſince publiſhed to the World as his Defence of it.

The Conſiderations were publiſhed under the Sanction of no ſmall Authority, and zealouſly propagated, and diſtributed *gratis*, for his Majeſty's Service; the Doctrine therefore therein laid down, is for ever

ever to be conſidered as the real and unalterable Doctrine which the Leaders of the Party and Patrons of the Book were wanting to have got eſtabliſhed in *Ireland* by paſſing the Clauſe; and that, as theſe Gentlemen are in no Sort anſwerable for the Author's Follies or Falſhoods in his latter Production, ſo neither are *they* to derive any Benefit from the Hardineſs of his Aſſertions, or the Ingenuity of his Chicaneries and Legerdemain.

What the real Doctrine is, which was laid down in the *Conſiderations* concerning this Article, the moſt intereſting, perhaps, that ever came under parliamentary Conſideration in this Kingdom, the Writer of the *Remarks* has moſt diſtinctly ſet forth in a few ſhort Propoſitions in the tenth Page of his Supplement, to the following Effect. 'That the Parliament of *Ireland* ſhould 'be obliged to make an authentic Acknowledg-'ment, in regard to all Applications of public 'Money remaining in the Treaſury, that the 'King, in Virtue of an ancient Right, is the '*ſole* Judge of the proper *Occaſion*, the *Time*, and 'the *Sum*, in all Inſtances of ſuch Application, 'and that no other Power in the Conſtitution can 'have the leaſt Pretence or Shadow of Right to 'point out, or, in any Manner, to intimate 'their Wiſhes in Regard to any Application of 'this Sort, without having firſt obtained his 'Majeſty's Leave to propoſe ſuch Application.'

In proof of this, ſee the Author's expreſs Words in *p.* 18, '*His Majeſty, under the conſti-'tutional Truſt, muſt be* THE *Judge of the Occaſion, 'the Time, and the Sum, for he ſolely has the exe-'cutive Power, and knows the various Exigencies of 'Government, and which of them ought to have the 'Preference in the Application. Conſequently when*

'*an*

'*an Application ſhall be propoſed by any other* '*Power, his Conſent muſt be obtained previous there-* '*unto,*' that is, previous to the making any ſuch Propoſal. The ſame Doctrine is laid down, ſtill at greater Length, in *p.* 34, and 35, concluding with this Paragraph,

'*If ſuch Truſt be in the Crown, the King's* '*Conſent is neceſſary previous to* PUBLICK DELI-'BERATIONS *on the Application; otherwiſe ſuch* '*Deliberations thereon, might lay the Crown under* '*great Difficulties, and be attended with bad Con-* '*ſequences to Government.*'

Here it is as expreſs as Words can well make it, that the Parliament is ſo far from having any Right, either by Bill or by Addreſs, to point out any Application to his Majeſty of this redundant Money, that they are not ſo much as at Liberty to make it the Subject of their Conſideration, or to take the leaſt parliamentary Notice concerning it, till his Majeſty ſhall firſt be graciouſly pleaſed to ſend his royal Permiſſion; and if ſuch Permiſſion ſhould happen not to be ſent, then muſt it be much the ſame thing to the Parliament, whether there be, in Fact, any ſuch redundant Money in the Receipt of the Treaſury, or not.

The ſecond Propoſition into which the *Remarker* reduced the Doctrine of the *Conſiderations* is as follows.

'That the King, it is true, ought to apply 'all this redundant Money for the Eaſe of the 'People, and for the public Service of this 'Nation; but that there is no Power upon Earth 'that has a Right to call for an Account, whe-

'ther this Money has been in Fact applied 'agreeably to this conſtitutional Truſt or not.'

The third Propoſition is in theſe Words:

'That the Parliament, it is likewiſe true, has 'a Right to puniſh thoſe who ſhall wickedly 'adviſe ſuch Acts as would be a Breach of this 'public Truſt, but that they can have no Power 'of coming at the Knowledge whether any 'Perſons had given ſuch wicked Advice or not, 'unleſs the Perſons who were guilty of the 'Breach of Truſt, in Conſequence of this Ad-'vice, ſhall graciouſly condeſcend to ſuffer the 'neceſſary Evidence to be laid before them.'

The fourth Propoſition.

'That there is a Right in the Commons to 'grant as much Money out of the Pockets of 'the People as they can be prevailed on to 'grant, but that the People can never have any 'other Means, in their own Right, of knowing, 'except by their feeling the ſenſible Effects, 'whether this Money comes afterwards to be 'applied to their Eaſe, or to their Oppreſſion, to 'the Service of the Public, or to the total 'Deſtruction of its moſt ineſtimable Liberties.'

That theſe three Propoſitions, together with the firſt, the Proof of which has been already pointed out, contain a Doctrine much more malignant to the Liberties of this Country than any thing that was ever advanced in the Time of Lord *Strafford*, no Man, who gives his Attention, can poſſibly diſpute; and that theſe three Propoſitions are capable of equally ſtrong Proof, from this Author's expreſs Words, with what has been produced for confirming the firſt, ſhall

now

now be made evident from the following Paſſage, *p.* 40. of *the Conſiderations.*

'*The principal Objection is, that the Produce of the ſeveral Funds is* ACCOUNTED FOR TO PARLIAMENT; *and from thence it has been inferred, that it is public Money, ſubject to parliamentary Application, without other Conſent, than what is given by the Royal Aſſent to the Bill, when paſſed into a Law.*'

No bad reaſoning this, if the Fact be really true, that the Produce is accounted for to Parliament in Virtue of the Parliament's Right to require ſuch an Account; and this our Author plainly confeſſes, when he calls this a principal Objection, but ſtill more ſtrongly, when, as the only Means to get rid of this Objection, he finds himſelf forced flatly to deny that the Parliament had ever any ſuch Right; for thus he goes on, '*This ſeems founded on a Miſtake, as to the Reaſon and Manner of laying the public Accounts before the Houſe of Commons.*'

'*No Account of the Diſpoſition of the King's Revenue was laid before Parliament till the Year one thouſand ſix hundred and ninety two, when the Crown wanted farther Supplies; then indeed a Motion was made that ſuch Accounts might be brought in, but the Reaſon of the Motion appears on the Journal,* viz. *That it might be the better known, what Supplies were neceſſary to be given to their Majeſties: So that they were* NOT CALLED FOR *as a* RIGHT, *but deſired as a Direction, for their Diſcretion in the Grants they were making; and, for the ſame Reaſon, they have been every Seſſion ſince brought into Parliament: ſo that, in Truth, were not Supplies demanded, ſuch Accounts would not have been tendered; and the going*

'*through the Accounts, is* ONLY *to enable the Houſe*
'*to judge what may be the Meaſure of the Supply,*
'*not to appropriate the Ballance, if any there ſhould*
'*be, for that remains as Money already veſted in the*
'*Crown for public Services.*'

It is no Part of the immediate Deſign to take any Notice of the Contraſt between what is peremptorily denied in this Quotation, and what is as ſtrongly affirmed in this Author's ſecond Production, though no Reader but muſt inſtantly perceive that the Terms are as oppoſite and contradictory the one to the other, as if they had come from the Mouths, or the Pens, of two moſt determined Adverſaries: What this Paſſage has now been produced for, is to prove that every Thing contained in the Propoſitions juſt above quoted from the *Supplement* to the *Remarks*, is fully and undeniably warranted by this *authoritative* Author's own Words;

For *firſt*, though he all along acknowledges, that the *King* ought to apply all this Money for the Eaſe of his People and the public Service of the Nation; yet he, in the ſtrongeſt Terms, in the above Paſſage, denies that the Parliament *can call for the national Accounts as their Right*, though theſe are the only Means whereby it can be known, whether this Money has in fact been applied, by his Majeſty's Servants, agreeably to this conſtitutional Truſt or not; and conſequently, that whatever Right the Parliament may have to puniſh thoſe who ſhall wickedly adviſe ſuch Acts as would be a Breach of this public Truſt, yet are they abſolutely diveſted of all Power and Means of coming at the Knowledge, whether any Perſons had given ſuch wicked Advice or not, unleſs the Perſons guilty of the Breach of Truſt, in conſequence of this Advice,

Advice, ſhall graciouſly condeſcend to ſuffer the neceſſary Evidence to be laid before them: Nay, he very ſtrongly intimates that this Condeſcention was never to be expected; the Sentence is very remarkable, ‘ *So that, in Truth,* ſaith he, *were* ‘ *not Supplies demanded, ſuch Accounts would not* ‘ *have been tendered.*

Quos Deus vult perdere, dementat prius!

And is it in Truth come to this! That under a legal Government, an Advocate for the Crown ſhall be careſſed, and his Doctrine propagated, by Folks of the firſt Authority, for publicly proclaiming that the only Reaſon why the Nation has been hitherto indulged the Satisfaction of knowing how the Money that was raiſed out of their Pockets has been employed, was, only to get more; and from the Moment that other Means can be fallen on in order to obtain future Supplies, the Nation is for ever after to go without the Satisfaction of knowing, in any other Way than by their own feeling, whether their Money has been applied to their Eaſe or to their Oppreſſion, to the Service of the Public, or towards the total Deſtruction of its moſt ineſtimable Liberties? — If our Author, in the true pettifogging Spirit, meant to provide a Subterfuge for himſelf by making uſe of the Word ‘ *tendered,*’ when the proper Word was ‘ *rendered,*’ it can ſtand him in no ſtead, as every Reaſon that will juſtify the not tendering, will likewiſe juſtify the not rendering any ſuch Account.

Behold now, courteous Reader, of whatever Denomination, Country, or Party! behold what accumulated Miſchief was avowedly intended to have been brought down on the devoted Head

of

of this poor but moſt loyal Kingdom, if this Clauſe had paſſed into a Law; and that thoſe who avowed the Intention, or Men of the ſame Spirit were to be the Executioners! but above all, behold, ye Sons of Liberty, what a glorious and critical Deliverance has been wrought for your Country, by the impregnable Virtue of your generous Patriots, who at the Expence of putting to Hazard every Emolument or Advantage that was peculiar to themſelves, reſcued the Liberties of *Ireland* by rejecting the Clauſe, the greateſt parliamentary Deliverance which ever was wrought for this Kingdom; and let your Eyes and your Hearts, with ſuitable Confidence and Gratitude, be fixed on thoſe Patriots, who, by working this great Deliverance, have given you the ſureſt and moſt infallible Pledges of their truly liberal Loyalty to their Prince, and their invariable Fidelity towards their Country; Affections inſeparable, in the Breaſt of every Subject who reliſhes the ineſtimable Bleſſing of living under a legal Government, and in a Land of Liberty.

And, on the other Hand, be it always remembered, that it is they, and they only, who make no Diſtinction in their external Subjection, between the Father of his People and the Man who wants to be their Tyrant; or between the Prince in his own Perſon, who is known invariably to mean well to the Intereſts and Liberties of his Subjects, and ſuch Delegates of his Power as through ſelfiſh Views, or petulent Paſſions, proceed to Violences tending unavoidably to break down the liberal Spirit of an affectionate People: It ought never to be forgotten, that it is Spirits of ſo ſlaviſh and degenerate a Caſt, who have at all Times been the principal Bane of the Liberties of every Country in which they had Influence.

Having

Having thus ſhewn, with ſuch Preciſion and Exactneſs, as it is preſumed cannot well admit of any Cavil or Reply, what the real Doctrine was which the Leaders intended to have got eſtabliſhed by paſſing the Clauſe, and which this Author, warranted by theſe Leaders, has expreſsly ſet forth as the Doctrine imply'd in the Clauſe; it is next to be ſhewn, that our Author, in his ſecond Production, abandons this Doctrine in its two fundamental Principles, and at the ſame Time throws away all Reputation for Truth or fair Dealing, in order, if poſſible, ſtill to be underſtood, as having vindicated the very Doctrine he is forced to abandon.

The two fundamental Principles of the real, and now unalterable Doctrine, are theſe, firſt, 'That the public Money redundant in the Treaſury is ſo abſolutely veſted in his Majeſty under the conſtitutional Truſt, that the King's Conſent is neceſſary previous to all *public Deliberations* in Parliament, concerning the Application of any of this Money:' The ſecond Principle is, 'that the Parliament has no Right whatſoever to call for the public Accounts, which contain the Application of this, and all other Money that goes into the Treaſury.'

The firſt of theſe Principles is totally given up, by our Author's expreſsly admitting, that the Houſe *may offer their Advice* concerning Applications of the public Money. Now, unleſs this Writer can ſhew, that the Houſe may offer their Advice without entering into any Deliberations, then is this firſt Principle abſolutely renounced, and the very Reverſe of it here poſitively affirmed; but affirmed in a Manner which does no great Honour to our Author's Regard for Truth;

Truth; his Words are, *for that the Houſe may offer their Advice is not controverted.* The only Ways which the Houſe uſually employs in offering their Advice, are, either by Heads of a Bill, or by an Addreſs; and ſhould our Author be preſſed on this Subject, it is much to be doubted, that, now he has got into the Humour of retracting, he would find it rather more to his Purpoſe to admit the Liberty of offering their Advice by the former than by the latter; it is true, that the Author ſeems to point at the latter, by ſaying, ‘ *that this hath never been thought* ‘ *concluſive*;’ but ſurely a Moment's Recollection would ſatisfy him, that neither is Advice offered by Heads of a Bill concluſive; and as the Reaſon he gives, when he was againſt the Parliament's preſuming to give any Sort of Advice, why they were not to enter on any Deliberations whatſoever concerning ſuch Application without the King's previous Conſent, is expreſſed in theſe Words, ‘ otherwiſe ſuch Deliberations ‘ thereon might lay the Crown under great Diffi- ‘ culties, and be attended with bad Conſequences ‘ to Government;’ this Reaſon will ſtill hold much ſtronger againſt offering Advice *by Addreſs* than by *Heads of a Bill*; by the former, it is obvious, that the Crown muſt be laid under much the greater Difficulty, if the Matter ſhould not be acceptable, becauſe the Application is made directly in Perſon to the King, and the Refuſal muſt appear to come immediately from himſelf; whereas there are ſeveral Ways of avoiding a Compliance with the Advice given by Heads of a Bill without his Majeſty's Regard to the Council of his faithful Commons coming in the leaſt into Queſtion.

But be this as it will, manifeſt it is, that the firſt grand Principle of the original Doctrine is here

here plainly given up: By the Doctrine, not ſo much as any Deliberation was permitted to the Commons, and here they are expreſsly allowed to have a *Right to give Advice.*

The ſecond fundamental Principle in the Doctrine laid down in the *Conſiderations*, is, 'That 'the Houſe has no Power whatſoever to call for 'the Accounts in their own Right *; *ſo that 'the Accounts were not called for as a Right*;' but in the ſecond Pamphlet, when the Writer is no longer under the Direction of his Patrons of Authority, he readily admits, that the Houſe had a Right *to call for Papers, Perſons, and Records*; and tho' this ſupercilious Manner of Expreſſion is not very ſuitable to the Reſpect which is due to this great Council of the Nation; yet what is comprehended under the Word Papers, is ſufficiently explained by what he ſays in *p.* 26. where he tells us, 'That according to the Principles 'laid down in the *Conſiderations, the Point was,* 'NOT *about the* GENERAL RIGHT *of calling for the* 'ACCOUNTS, *or any other Papers:*' Here again, every one muſt be ſenſible, that the eſſential Principle of the Doctrine of *the Conſiderations* is hereby expreſsly given up, and given up at the Expence of aſſerting a Falſhood directly contrary to Eye-ſight.

But theſe are only *Specimens* of the *Nature* of that Candor which our Author profeſſes in *p.* 3. where he tells us, 'that had *the Proceedings* 'given the Writer of *the Conſiderations* cauſe to 'alter his Opinion, he would have made no 'ſcruple of publicly retracting it.' — Let us next look a little into his Reaſoning.

* See *Conſiderations*, p. 41.

What this Gentleman could mean by inſinuating, *p.* 7. that the Author of the *Proceedings*, was unwilling to admit of the King's *Right* of *applying* the public Money under the *general Truſt* is not eaſy to be conceived, as that able Writer doth moſt explicitly admit this Right in the very Place to which he refers, *p.* 41. when after quoting the following Paſſage from our Author, *viz.* 'That the Truſt of applying 'the Money given by Parliament to the Crown 'without any ſpecial Appropriation, is by the 'Laws and Conſtitution of this Kingdom veſted 'in the Crown *for* PUBLIC *Services*,' he immediately expreſſes himſelf thus; 'It is very ſur-'prizing, that Contention about this Matter 'ſhould longer ſubſiſt, when both Sides *agree in* '*Principles*:' In Reality, how was it poſſible, that any Man could be ſuſpected to have any Difficulty concerning ſo ſelf-evident a Principle? For if the King had not a Right to apply the public Money under the Truſt, how would it be practicable for the King, in whom the executive Power is lodged, to adminiſter the Affairs of Government?

But whatever the Author may have had in his Eye, by throwing out ſo foul an Inſinuation, it may be proper here to point out a Fallacy which ſeems to have done no ſmall Miſchief in this Controverſy, contained under the Phraſe of the GENERAL TRUST: In Strictneſs and Propriety, there is a two-fold Truſt veſted in the Crown; the one, an *eſſential Conſtitutional*, the other, a *variable Parliamentary Truſt*, in regard to the Application of the public Money: In virtue of the Firſt, which ariſes from the Nature of our Form of Government, the King, as

the

the executive Power in the Society, muſt of Neceſſity be veſted with a Truſt of applying ſuch part of the public Money as he ſhall upon any Emergency find neceſſary, for the Safety of the State; without having any Reſpect to *Deficiencies* that may, by this Means, be occaſioned in any of the neceſſary Branches of the Eſtabliſhment; and as the Father of his People he is likewiſe always obliged to adminiſter this Truſt, let the *Redundancy* that may remain behind be ever ſo large, ſo as will moſt effectually conduce to the Eaſe of his People, and the public Service of this Kingdom: This *general conſtitutional Truſt*, reſulting from the Nature of the Relation which the King ſtands in to his People, it is evident, has nothing to do either with *Deficiencies or Redundancies* in the *Treaſury*; if the Uſes to which this Money has been applied, ſhall be found by his Parliament, to have been proper Uſes, and neceſſary for the Safety of the State, and for anſwering the Emergencies or unforeſeen and unprovided-for Exigencies of Government, the Parliament will doubtleſs, agreeably to their Duty, let the Deficiencies in anſwering the uſual Expences of Government have been by this means what they will, make proper Proviſion for the ſeaſonable Supply of them; and on the other hand, when at any time, after all the ordinary as well as theſe extraordinory Expences of Government, have been diſcharged, there ſhall remain Part of the Money of the Public ſtill to be diſpoſed of, can there be an Objection in Nature, why the Houſe of Commons ſhould not either propoſe an immediate Application of this Money towards making good thoſe former Deficiencies; or ſhould theſe have been already anſwered, then to conſider it as ſo much Money already raiſed off the

People towards anſwering the uſual neceſſary Expences of Government for the two Years to come? Thus from the Nature of this *general conſtitutional Truſt*, it would ſeem, that inſtead of *the Parliament's* having nothing to do with Redundancies in the Treaſury according to the Doctrine of the *Conſiderations*, it matters but very little to *the Crown*, eſpecially in the Time of Parliament, whether there be any ſuch Redundancies or not; ſeeing the King may be always aſſured of being ſeaſonably ſupplied both for the ordinary and the eventual Exigencies of Government for the two Years to come, whether the Treaſury happened to be redundant or deficient at the Cloſe of the two Years immediately preceding or not: In regard to this primary and conſtitutional Truſt, it only remains to be obſerved, that ſo long as the Prince continues to act as the Father of his People, there can be no great Hazard of any captious Inquiries of his Parliament concerning the Exerciſe of this indefinite Truſt; but ſtill there is a moſt evident and abſolute Neceſſity, that the Parliament ſhould have it in their Power carefully to look into the national Accounts and Diſburſements, and to be at Liberty ſuitably to expreſs either their Approbation or their Cenſure concerning all ſuch royal or miniſterial Applications.

Diſtinct from this general, eſſential, *conſtitutional Truſt*; there is likewiſe a ſpecific, variable, *Parliamentary Truſt* repoſed biennially in the Crown; whereby the Houſe of Commons, after having computed from Eſtimates, that a Sum, not exceeding a certain-mentioned Sum, will be ſufficient, together with the hereditary Revenue; to anſwer the current Services of Government for two Years to come, veſts certain Duties in the Crown, the Produce of which according to their

their Expectation would amount to this Sum; and being ſenſible that ſhould Matters fall ſhort of their Expectation, all Deficiencies muſt be made good by them out of the Pockets of the People the following Seſſion of Parliament, and therefore in Caſe of Redundancies, knowing that this Redundancy is ſtill the People's Money, they proceed without heſitation to place ſuch Redundancy to the Credit of the Nation; and generally place it as the firſt Article to be applied to the current Services of Government, then to be provided for the two Years to come.

It muſt be evident to Senſe, that theſe Services thus to be provided for, muſt be taken out of that *vague Univerſality of public Services in general*, otherways no Eſtimates could be properly formed concerning them; accordingly, we find, that the Commons, in order to their fixing the *Quantum* of the Supply, always reduce theſe Services under diſtinct and determinate Articles, and then form Computations of the Expence that will be requiſite in regard to each of theſe Heads; nay, we ſometimes find them ſpecifying theſe Heads in the *Act of Parliament* granting the Supply; thus in the Sixth of King *George* the Firſt, the Preamble runs, '*for the* '*better Support of the neceſſary Expences of the* '*Public, and for ſecuring* THE REPAYMENT OF 'THE DEBT,' and in the next Seſſion, the Words are, '*making good the neceſſary Branches* '*of your Eſtabliſhment, and ſecuring the Repay-* '*ment of the Debt.*' Judge now whether the learned Author of *the Proceedings* be not hereby perfectly juſtified, in making uſe of the Word, *appropriated*, when he is obſerving in *p.* 51. 'that *the Sum in Credit*, whatever it hath been, 'was ever *appropriated* to the current Service of the

'the next Term, for which the Supply was 'granted.' Yet our wonderful Critic tells us in *p.* 15. That '*this carries an Abſurdity on the Face* '*of it, for an Appropriation* is an *Application* to a 'ſpecial Purpoſe!' — That there is an Abſurdity ſomewhere, no-body will deny; but whether imputable to the Author, or to the Critic, let all the World judge.

Thus, tho' the Parliament never meant to controul the conſtitutional Truſt ſo eſſential in its nature for the Safety of the Community, yet it is as plain as Words and Facts, and as the Nature of the Thing can make it, that the biennial Supplies are not granted vaguely for public Services in general, but intended for determinate Services, which for a Courſe of near forty Years, have been invariably ſpecified by the Commons in their Reſolutions for the Supply under the Heads of *Payment of the national Debt, and ſupporting the neceſſary Branches of the Eſtabliſhment.*

So far therefore as applying the redundant Money in the actual Receipt of the Treaſury, along with the current Supplies, to theſe ſpecific Services, partakes of the Nature of an Appropriation; or '*of taking the Money out of the Trea-* '*ſury, and from the general Truſt, and applying* '*it to a particular Purpoſe* *;' and ſo far as any of the *Sums brought to the Credit of the Nation* at the Cloſe of the former Year's Accounts, was Money at that Time in the actual Receipt of the Treaſury, or certainly to come into it, in a little Time after, ſo far it is as evident as Demonſtration can make it, 'That it has been the 'Practice,

* See *p.* 2, 3.

'Practice, and the acknowledged Right of the 'Commons, to propoſe Appropriations of the 'ſurplus Money in the Treaſury, without any '*previous Leave* or *promiſed Conſent* from the 'Crown.'

This our Author would ſeem to have been ſenſible of, and therefore, in order to get rid of it, he finds himſelf forced, firſt flatly to deny that any of theſe *Sums of Credit* were Money in the actual Receipt of the Treaſury; and next, intrepidly to aſſert, That if theſe Sums or Ballances ſhould be admitted as Money in the actual Receipt of the Treaſury, yet would the propoſed Application of them be nothing to the Purpoſe, becauſe, this was only appointing them to make Part of the enſuing Supply, and in no ſort taking them out of the general Truſt; for the Supplies themſelves were granted ſolely under the general Truſt, and not for any ſpecified Purpoſes! — In Reality, one would be apt to imagine, that this Author conſidered theſe Words, of a 'general Truſt,' not as denoting an abſtract Idea applicable to a Variety of external real Purpoſes in Government, but as an external real Exiſtence of itſelf, or what the Schools fooliſhly called an *univerſale a parte Rei!*

But his being a bad Logician is not the worſt of it: It has juſt now been proved to the Conviction of Eye-ſight, that theſe biennial Parliamentary Supplies are granted, not only according to the invariable Form of the Reſolutions of the Houſe, at the Times they were granting them, but likewiſe, by expreſs Words in our Acts of Parliament, for the determinate Purpoſes of 'making good the neceſſary Branches 'of his Majeſty's Eſtabliſhment, and for ſecur-

'ing

'ing the Repayment of the national Debt.' Either, then, theſe Purpoſes muſt be admitted of the Nature of Appropriations, in which Caſe the whole of the Queſtion is fairly and abſolutely given up; or elſe the Diſcharging the national Debt, for Inſtance, muſt be conſidered as conſtituting a ſpecific Article under the general Truſt, to which the Commons, *without any previous Leave*, have explicitly pointed out, for a long Courſe of Years, an Application of Part of theſe biennial Supplies; and then, it muſt be palpable to Senſe, *That* the Houſe of Commons, in propoſing to the Crown, in their own Right, an Application of the Money redundant in the Treaſury towards the Diſcharge of the national Debt, did no more than what had been their conſtant Practice and their acknowledged Right to do, in pointing out the Application of the uſual Supplies, in which was often comprehended, Money already in the actual Receipt of the Treaſury; a Practice that had continued without the leaſt Interuption for a Courſe of near forty Years.

The only Article in the whole of this Argument which can poſſibly ſtand in need, or even admit of any fuller Proof is, *That* the Sums brought in any Inſtance to the Credit of the Nation, and ſet apart by the Commons, as the firſt Article for the future Supply, were Money actually in the Receipt of the Treaſury, at the Time that the Houſe were ſettling the Ways and Means for anſwering the Supply; and tho' this has been already as fully ſet forth, both in *the Proceedings*, and in the fourth Number of the *Remarks*, as Words and Figures can expreſs it, yet as our Author, in his intrepid Manner, has, in the following Paſſage, *p.* 16, moſt expreſsly denied it, an Inſtance or two ſhall again be repeated; our Author's Words, are,

'*Beſides*,

'*Beſides, the Reader is to be apprized, that theſe*
'*Sums in Credit, are* NOT *the Ballance of Money*
'*in the Treaſury, and conſequently no way relate*
'*to the preſent Queſtion, which ariſes on the Ap-*
'*plication of a Ballance in the actual Receipt of*
'*the Treaſury,*' he goes on, '*The Author of the*
'*Vindication did not find it for his Purpoſe to*
'*take Notice of this Diſtinction, altho' pointed out*
'*in* the Conſiderations; *but it is of too much*
'*Conſequence to be omitted in the Diſcuſſion of*
'*this Queſtion.*' Again in *p.* 18. '*But until the Au-*
'*thor of the Proceedings can ſhew, that the Bal-*
'*lances ſtruck by the Accomptant-General, induce a*
'*Charge on the Treaſury, which he hath not been,*
'*nor will be, able to do; this Circumſtance is of no*
'*Weight in the preſent Caſe.*' Immediately after this, comes an aſtoniſhing Paragraph; '*But to*
'*deſcend into a more particular Examination of this*
'*Writer's Proofs —— In* 1703, *the Committee of*
'*Ways and Means reſolved it to be their Opinion,*
'*that ſuch Debt as ſhould appear due to the Na-*
'*tion (great Part whereof was outſtanding) ſhould*
'*be taken and reckoned as Part, and that the Du-*
'*ties to be granted, being rated and valued at cer-*
'*tain Sums ſhonld be taken as the Reſt of the Supply*
'*voted: to which Reſolutions, the Houſe agreed.*' Mark here the Parentheſis, (great Part whereof was outſtanding) is not this, in the ſtrongeſt Terms, to acknowledge that *Part was actually got into the Treaſury*, or into the Hands of the Collectors of the Revenue? and is not this a direct Contradiction to what he had aſſerted juſt before, '*That none of*
'*theſe Sums of Credit were a Ballance of Money*
'*in the Treaſury, and that none of the Ballances*
'*ſtruck by the Officer, would induce a Charge on*
'*the Treaſury?*' Nay, he immediately after, gives up the Diſtinction, which the Moment before he had accuſed the Author of the *Proceedings*, for omit-

ting to take notice of, and which he then inſiſts to be of too much Conſequence in the Diſcuſſion of this Queſtion to be overlooked; for thus he goes on, 'all that can be inferred from hence is, 'that the Houſe computed what Sum would be ne-'ceſſary for the publick Service until their next 'Meeting' (by the Way, how could this Computation be made, if it was meant for *public Services in general?*) 'And by the additional Duties 'they granted ſo much, as together with THE 'BALLANCE, *would, in their Opinions, make up* 'that Sum: But they did not APPROPRIATE ei-'ther THE BALLANCE *or* THE DUTIES. *Both* 'were left under the CONSTITUTIONAL TRUST 'for PUBLIC SERVICES IN GENERAL;' which is as much as to ſay, that had this Ballance and theſe Duties been in any Senſe appropriated, the Whole muſt be given up; and that the Houſe had A RIGHT of *appropriating* this Ballance, and theſe Duties, or at leaſt an indefinite Part of them, is expreſsly acknowledged in *the Conſiderations*; 'In the Acts granting theſe additional Duties, ſome 'Appropriations are generally ſpecified,' *p.* 32. and in many other Places: But how eaſy is it for this Author, by a few bold Affirmations or Negations, to rid himſelf at once of all this Inconſiſtency, the Article of Truth being a Circumſtance with him quite foreign to the Subject; for

Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirat?

The Inſtances juſt now promiſed, may be taken from the Journals of 1747 and 1749. In the former, the Committee reports, that the Ballance due to the Credit of the Nation at *Lady Day* 1747, amounted to 176821*l.* 9*s.* 10*d.* this Sum the Committee of Accounts, in the Year 1749, adds to the neat Produce of the he-

reditary

reditary and additional Duties for the two Years laſt paſt, and to a Sum of 58,500*l.* which had been paid into the Treaſury on Account of the laſt Loan, the whole amounting to 1,084,176*l.* 11*s.* ½, out of which they deduct the Expences of the civil and military Eſtabliſhment, and all other Government or parliamentary Expences for thoſe two laſt preceding Years, making in all 905,972*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* and thus ſtrike a Ballance of 178,203*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.* ½, as the exact Sum remaining in Credit to the Nation at *Lady Day*, 1749. Now I would aſk any intelligent Reader; muſt not this Money, or, at leaſt the greateſt Part of it, have been *Money in the actual Receipt of the Treaſury*, eſpecially when one hundred and twenty-eight Thouſand, five hundred Pounds, were, by Act of Parliament, that ſame Seſſion, ordered to be paid out of it, towards the Diſcharge of the national Debt?

And, now to bring this Argument to a Concluſion, an Argument which it is hoped will anſwer ſtill more extenſive and uſeful Purpoſes than merely to detect the Falſhood and Fallacies of our Author, and thereby ſecure the Public from being farther impoſed on by his Writings; —— ſeeing it is the *acknowledged* Right, and has been ſhewn to have been the undeniable Practice of the Houſe of Commons to blend the redundant Money, which they at any Time found remaining in the Treaſury, along with the Money that they compute will be brought into the Treaſury in Conſequence of the Duties they are then preparing to grant for the enſuing biennial Supply, doth it not follow with all the Force of the ſtricteſt Demonſtration,

'That ſo far as it has been the acknowledged and undoubted Practice and Right of the Houſe of Commons of *Ireland*, without any previous Intimation of the Royal Conſent, to point out to the Crown, by Heads of a Bill, an Application of Money intended for the biennial Supplies, to any ſpecific or determinate Uſes, ſo far it muſt of Neceſſity have been their Practice and their Right to point out an Application of the *redundant Money in the Treaſury*, which they had thus blended with theſe biennial Supplies; to the ſame ſpecific or determinate Uſes.

'But it has been the acknowledged and undoubted Practice and Right of the Commons of *Ireland*, without any previous Intimation of the Royal Conſent, to point out to the Crown, by Heads of a Bill, an Application of theſe biennial Supplies, to a Variety of ſpecific or determinate Uſes, particularly, for a Courſe of near forty Years, towards the Payment of the national Debt:

'Therefore it is the undoubted Right, and has been the acknowledged Practice of the Commons of *Ireland*, without any previous Intimation of the Royal Conſent, to point out to the Crown, by Heads of a Bill, an Application of the redundant Money which they found in the actual Receipt of the Treaſury, to a Variety of ſpecific and determinate Uſes, and particularly *towards the Payment of the national Debt.*

Thus, in the Manner in which the Facts and Circumſtances relative to this parliamentary Truſt happen in Reality to turn out, there evidently reſults from them, a Demonſtration, even in Terms,

That

'That the Houſe of Commons had an acknowledged and inconteſtable Right, to point out to his Majeſty, in the very Manner they did laſt Seſſion of Parliament, AN APPLICATION of the Money lying in the Treaſury, FOR PAYMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT; a Right in themſelves, independentof any *previous Recommendation* from the Crown, and which they were by the Conſtitution, equally warranted and authorized to exerciſe, whether there had, or had not been any Intimation beforehand, that *his Majeſty would be graciouſly pleaſed to give his Conſent.* — And this, if the Writer miſtakes not, doth moſt fully comprehend, and as fully decide in Favour of the Houſe of Commons, every Article and Circumſtance, which had any material Relation to the great Queſtion in Debate, this laſt Seſſion of Parliament; and therefore muſt for ever remain a complete Demonſtration of *what was to be proved.*

But what Man of Senſe is there, who doth not clearly perceive, that tho' the *parliamentary Truſt* had been differently expreſſed, and that the Commons had in Reality ſatisfied themſelves with veſting the public Money by *general Terms* in the *Royal Truſtee*, to be made uſe of for the Eaſe of the People, and the public Services of this Kingdom; even on this Suppoſition, what Man is there, who doth not inſtantly ſee that the real Nature and Juſtice of the Caſe would have been exactly the ſame?

Is not the Money redundant in the Treaſury ſtill acknowledged to be the Money of the Public? Is not the *Payment of the national Debt* acknowledged to be comprehended within the Terms

Terms of the *general Truſt?* Can there then be any poſſible Reaſon, why the Repreſentatives of the People, who *veſted* this *general Truſt*, ſhould not be at Liberty to point out any one of the particular Purpoſes which they knew, and which is expreſsly confeſſed, to be comprehended within the Deſign of this Truſt, which they themſelves had veſted? Eſpecially when it is farther conſidered, that theſe Repreſentatives of the People, are, and muſt be acknowledged to have a Right, an inherent Right, not only of pointing out in their Bill of Supply, an Appropriation of ſuch Part of ſaid Supply, as they think requiſite for certain particular Purpoſes ſpecified in the Bill, but at the Time of forming the Eſtimate of the *Quantum* to be granted for the Supply, to govern their Diſcretion, by the State of *Redundancy or Deficiency* in which they find the Treaſury at the Time of making the Grant: For can there be the leaſt conceivable Difference, in Reaſon and Senſe, between propoſing, for Inſtance, an Appropriation of ſeventy-ſeven thouſand Pounds out of the Money already in the Treaſury, for the Payment of the Reſidue of the *national Debt*, and their taking in this redundant Money in the Treaſury, as the firſt Article of their Eſtimate or Computation towards the enſuing Supply, and then pointing out in their Bill, an Appropriation of ſeventy-ſeven thouſand Pounds out of this Supply, to be applied to the Payment of this ſame remaining Sum of the *national Debt*; which it is admitted by their greateſt Adverſaries they had a Right to have done?

In Truth, ſo long as this Money continues to be acknowledged the Money of the Nation, committed to his Majeſty, *only in Truſt*; it muſt be impoſſible to put ſuch a Conſtruction on the Nature

of

of this Truſt, as to preclude the *Repreſentatives* of the People out of whoſe Pockets the Money was raiſed, the very Perſons who *veſted this Truſt*, and who at the ſame Time are his Majeſty's propereſt Council in Matters of this Sort, to preclude theſe, from pointing out and recommending to his Majeſty ſuch an Application of this *truſt Money* as they think moſt conducive to anſwer the Ends, and which they *certainly know to come fairly within the original Purpoſes* of this general Truſt.

Take the very Alluſion of our Author; where he compares this *Truſt*, at the Bottom of *p.* 8, to *a Gift to be diſpoſed of generally in Charities*: A charitable good Lady being obliged to change the Place of her Reſidence, commits a Sum of Money into the Hands of the Miniſter of the Pariſh, to be diſpoſed of in Charities; at ſome Diſtance of Time, upon her Return, ſhe is informed, that Part of her Bounty remained ſtill undiſpoſed of; and perceiving at the ſame Time, that there was an immediate Opportunity of applying this Remainder to an excellent Purpoſe, which both ſhe and her Truſtee, knew perfectly to have been comprehended among the principal Objects of the original Truſt, ſhe inſtantly writes a Letter to her Truſtee, recommending, that the Reſidue of her Charity might now be appy'd to this diſtinguiſhed good Uſe; would it not be wondrous ſtrange, if the Miniſter ſhould ſend back the Letter, acknowledging, that the Uſe was indeed extreamly proper and good; but peremptorily inſiſting, that, before he would comply with it, the Lady muſt acknowledge under her Hand, and in the Body of the Letter, that ſhe had no Kind of Right ſo much as to mention it to him, till he had firſt given her Leave!

But

But to go on a little further with this preſent Alluſion: As this Bounty of the Lady's was intended to be renewed, to what Purpoſe, not to comply with the Lady's acknowledged moſt proper Recommendation? ſeeing ſhe had a confeſſed and an unqueſtionable Right in regard to the enſuing Seaſon's charitable Supply, to point out Applications of ſuch Part or Portion of it as ſhe ſhould ſee requiſite, as well for anſwering the Charity ſhe had formerly recommended, as for any other particular good Purpoſes that ſince had occurred to her.

In all Caſes of this Sort, it would ſeem moſt natural to imagine, that the Miniſter, who knew himſelf to be only a Truſtee, ſhould earneſtly wiſh, that it were convenient for the Lady to reſide oftener in the Pariſh, in order that he might enjoy more of the Benefit of the Council of ſo ſuitable an Adviſer; but ſurely ſomething very extraordinary muſt be the Cauſe, that, at the very Time, when the Lady happens to be actually reſident, the Miniſter by ſome Means or other, is brought to inſiſt on wondrous, new Meaſures of Delicacy and Subordination, ſome of them deemed directly inconſiſtent with the Dignity, and manifeſtly injurious to the Rights of the Lady, before he will ſo much as *permit* her to offer *her Advice!*

What has already been pointed out, it is preſumed by the Writer, muſt prove at all Times ſufficient as an Antidote againſt whatever Poiſon our Author, by his Arts in Writing, ſhall for the Future attempt to inſinuate into the truly well and rightly affected Minds of his Majeſty's moſt faithful Subjects in this Kingdom; and, which

is

is of ſtill greater Conſequence, it is likewiſe preſumed, that theſe honeſt and free-born Subjects will, by what has been ſet before them in the Courſe of this Paper, the more clearly diſcern, *That* however various the Intention might have been in urging this CLAUSE, and however uniformly in Words, the Friends of it, had it been paſt, might have continued to aſſert that the redundant Money would be ſtill as much as ever the Money of the Nation, yet all rational Security would have been in Fact taken away for preventing the greateſt Part of this Money from becoming for the Future, not in name, but in thing, Money lying at the Mercy of the Miniſtry or Miniſter.

God forbid, then, my worthy Fellow-countrymen, that ever you ſhould ſuffer yourſelves to be betrayed into the unnatural Guilt of ſuch monſtrous Ingratitude, as not invariably to hold the Men and their Memories in the moſt laſting and grateful Remembrance, who, negligent of all peculiar Intereſts of their own, ſo critically vindicated and maintained to THIS NATION, THE RIGHT OVER THE PURSE, that only valid Security, for all the other Rights and Liberties of this Country!

It remains now, only, to take a little Notice of an Art ſtill more inſidious than thoſe yet expoſed, an Art ſeldom thought fit to be committed to Paper, but practiſed with great Addreſs and Aſſiduity in the Courſe of Converſation.

How often will you hear the Men who value themſelves, particularly, on their Knowledge of the World, cry out upon the Public as a Parcel of Fools, for ever troubling their Heads about

Matters of the preſent Nature and Sort; aſking with an Air of ſuperior and peremptory Deciſion, doth not every Man of Senſe very well know, that all this is nothing more than a Quarrel between a few of our great Men contending for Power; and what matters it to the Nation which of them prevail?

That moſt of the Struggles and Convulſions which happen in a State, may in ſome Senſe be properly enough termed Quarrels among great Men, no-body will diſpute; but ſurely it is a ſtrange Leap from thence, inſtantly to conclude, that therefore the Public is no way intereſted in them!

The Revolution has often been called a Quarrel between the Prince of *Orange* and King *James*; but were not the Liberties of *Britain* and *Ireland*, nay the Liberties of *Europe* manifeſtly depending on the Iſſue of that Quarrel? Is not this preſent Language, the very Language which was uſed on the Change of the Miniſtry in the latter End of the Reign of Queen *Anne?* What, uſed theſe deep Politicians at that Time warmly to urge, What was the Public concerned, whether *Godolphin* and *Marlborough* on the one Hand, or *Oxford* and *Ormond* on the other, were the Servants of the Crown? and yet every one knows, that had not the Providence of GOD moſt critically interpoſed, either the *Pretender*, or a bloody civil War in behalf of the *Houſe* of *Hanover*, and for ſecuring a legal Government in theſe Kingdoms, muſt have been the neceſſary Production of that fatal Change!

Would theſe deep Politicians have the Public in earneſt believe, 'That it no way concerns them,

them, whether the principal Adminiſtration of the internal Intereſts of this Kingdom be committed into the Hands of Men, who, it is demonſtrable, cannot ſo much as hope to maintain that unnatural Pre-eminence to which, by a Concurrence of various Means, they have happen'd to be exalted, without for ever continuing to do Violence to *the Rights*, till they have effectually broken down the *liberal Spirit* of the Proteſtant Inhabitants of this Country; or whether this Truſt be committed into Hands where the People have all the rational Foundation of Confidence, which the Nature of ſuch Things can afford, that the *general Intereſt* and *national Rights*, muſt be effectually cared for; ſeeing otherways theſe Men can have no reaſonable Security for the ſafe Poſſeſſion and permanent Enjoyment of their own: — Is there a Man of Senſe in this Kingdom, who can ſet his Face to it, and aſſert, 'That it no way concerns the Public, Whether the Men who feel themſelves under no other Obligations, than thoſe which ariſe from Humanity and Juſtice, to wiſh well to the Liberties and legal Government of this Kingdom, and who may poſſibly be under the outrageous Impetus of a ſpurious Ambition from within, and of various powerful Temptations from without, to ſet at nought theſe Obligations, whether ſuch Men as theſe, or Men who are under every Obligation both of Duty and Intereſt, that can influence the human Heart, to continue invariably faithful to their *general Truſt*, and have actually given Proof of this their ſtedfaſt Fidelity, BE THE MEN, to whom the principal internal Guardianſhip of the general Liberties, Rights and Proſperity of this Country ſhall in Fact be intruſted?

But thoſe Gentlemen who are ſo fond of reſolving all our public preſent Appearances, into private and perſonal Quarrels, would do well, not only to point out diſtinctly who theſe turbulent great Men are, but to whom or to which Side it has been owing, that ſo many ſingular and miſchievous Occurrences have happened to this Country during the Courſe of the preſent Adminiſtration: To whoſe Charge, for Inſtance, is it to be laid, that ſo perfectly new and alarming a Language was introduced into Parliament in the Seſſion 1751, relative to the *previous Conſent* of the *Crown*, in regard to the Parliament's propoſing an Application of the public Money, already raiſed by the Parliament, for the public Uſes of this Kingdom?

To which of theſe Men, in the next Place, was it owing, that ſo fatal an Alteration was made in our *Linen Bill*, in the Courſe of that Seſſion, at leaſt to which Side was it owing, that after the Government had notice of this Alteration, all the Circumſtances of the Alteration were ſo induſtriouſly concealed? concealed at the Expence of the groſſeſt Miſrepreſentations of Facts; Miſrepreſentations, groſs as they were, which had they not been ſeaſonably, or rather critically detected, muſt have plunged this Country into a deſperate State of Wretchedneſs before they were in any ſort apprized of their Danger; and long after the Nature of the Alteration had been detected, was it not principally owing to the Wiſdom, particularly, and reſolute Zeal of ONE EMINENT PATRIOT, at the beginning of this laſt Seſſion, equally eminent, whether you contemplate his Abilities, his Services, or the Severity of his Sufferings in the Cauſe of his Country, that Meaſures

ſures were prevented in regard to this Bill, which had they taken place, muſt in all Probability have either quickly occaſioned the total Deſtruction of this national Support; or elſe, for the Sake of prolonging its precarious Exiſtence, muſt have brought this Country into a State ſtill more wretched, becauſe ignominious, 'to crouch and lye down, at 'the imperious Nod, of every Deputy of a De-'puty, of a firſt Miniſter's Deputy.'

Theſe wondrous Adepts in the Knowledge of the World are ſtill farther requeſted to explain, to which Side we are indebted for that matchleſs political Letter, by which the *Commons* of *Ireland*, are magiſterially required, with the Iron Rod of Power, pretendedly held over their Head, totally to renounce their own Underſtanding, and implicitly to give themſelves up to the Conduct of whatever Leaders it ſhall pleaſe the *perſonated* Writer of the Letter to honour with his Confidence; what matters it, however courtly the Language may be thought, or however well imitated the Style; ſurely there is not a Man of a liberal Spirit in the Kingdom, who will not readily acknowledge, that the MEANING was only fit for the Heart and the Mouth of the Duke of *Tyrconnel*, or his Maſter, King *James*, to his *mock Iriſh Parliament*.

Laſt of all, theſe Gentlemen are requeſted candidly to pronounce, whether, in ſad ſober Earneſt, it ought to be a Matter of Indifference to the Public, to which Side it was owing, that the Parliament was ſo critically reſcued from giving up its *Paladium*, or Power over the Purſe, which muſt have quickly degraded the *Houſe of Commons of Ireland*, below the meaneſt *Grand Jury*, to be found in the Kingdom.

That

That theſe were among the principal Occaſions of the preſent national Agitation no-body can deny; and ſhould it, upon the ſtricteſt and the moſt impartial Inquiry, the more clearly turn out, that the principal Ferment has been occaſioned by the boundleſs Ambition of any one Perſon, who, without having any viſible Connexion, in point of Intereſt, with the national Intereſts and Liberties of this Country, but demonſtrably the Reverſe, has already got an unnatural Share of the Power of this Country, a Share without Example, into his Hands, and is inceſſantly graſping at more; or if it ſhould likewiſe, partly be owing to a threatning Luſt of Power in another, where, by having already acquired an overgrown Property, and an Influence inſeparable from it, throughout the Country, the Poſſeſſor may naturally be led to flatter himſelf, that by a temporary Compliance with the Ambition of the former, he may the ſooner be enabled to acquire in the Iſſue, the real Preeminence, and to lay a permanent Foundation for a more extenſive Domination, for himſelf and his Family; ſhould theſe Articles turn out to have been in truth and demonſtrably the principal Ingredients in the Cauſe of this Quarrel, will it the more readily follow from thence, that therefore the Public are in no ſort concerned in the Succeſs of this Struggle.

Countrymen, let no Men deceive you out of your Senſes; no Perſon can poſſibly be ſuppoſed to intend honeſtly towards the Incloſure, who is for ever lending his Hand to break down the Hedge.

6 DE 58

F I N I S.

19